

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 155.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, just a moment, please. I think a measure similar to the one referred to was agreed to sometime ago. I think it later was reconsidered on motion of the able senior Senator from Montana. It provided for the appointment of a committee by the Vice President. I believe it now is desired to have the committee appointed by the chairman of the committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 155), which was read.

Mr. WHEELER. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, lines 1 and 2, it is proposed to strike out "a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate" and insert "the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the adequacy of the supply of hydroelectric power generated in Government plants; (2) whether such supply is properly allocated and distributed for war purposes and civilian uses; (3) whether the distribution of such supply is made under proper conditions and safeguards; (4) the relation between the generation of hydroelectric power at Government plants and irrigation; and (5) whether plans for future development of Government hydroelectric plants provide for full utilization of such facilities for both development of electric power and providing water for irrigation. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expendi-

tures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes, p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 28, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Francis T. Spellman, June 30, 1942.

Charles D. Leffler, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Alan R. McCracken, January 1, 1942.

George L. Menoal, June 30, 1942.

Burton Davis, June 30, 1942.

Robert M. Morris, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Rufus L. Taylor, May 1, 1941.

Roger M. Keithly, January 1, 1942.

Harry A. Barnard, Jr., May 19, 1942.

Charles M. Holcombe, June 30, 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942:

Eli B. Roth William G. Kornahrens

Robert C. Barnes Charles Holovak

Clarence W. Becker David G. Bryce

The following passed assistant surgeons, to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Arthur W. Eaton, Jr., January 1, 1942.

Stephen E. Flynn, June 30, 1942.

The following assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Howell E. Wiggins Robert O. Canada, Jr.

Robert B. Greenman Vernon E. Martens

William F. Queen

Passed Assistant Dental Surgeon James H. Connelly to be a dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942.

Assistant Dental Surgeon Edward V. Barth to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy to rank from the 9th day of June 1943, to conform with the change in name effected prior to graduation from the Naval Academy:

Richard J. Kroth

Jonathan J. Crowder

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942:

Franklin M. Haines, Jr.

William F. Babcock

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Chester J. Kurzawa to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank

of ensign, to rank from the 6th day of June 1940:

Louis N. Saunders, Jr.

Robert R. Wooding

Ensign John F. Tynan, SC-V (G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 19th day of November 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Norman D. Cann Harold N. Graves

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Francis L. McNamee, of Pennsylvania, to be regional manpower director, at \$8,000 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE TO BE SURGEONS

Joseph G. Pasternack	Robert H. Onstott
Waldemar J. A. Wickman	John L. Wilson
Llewellyn L. Ashburn	George G. Van Dyke
Leland J. Hanchett	Leslie McC. Smith
Thomas B. McKneely	Alfred B. Geyer
William G. Workman	Oliver C. Williams
Victor H. Vogel	Austin V. Delbert
Robert H. Flinn	Richard C. Arnold
Robert K. Maddock	Donald W. Patrick
Roy E. Butler	Marion K. King
	Thurman H. Rose

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

William A. Miller	David B. Wilson
Robert L. Smith	Ralph W. Pagel
Joe M. Chisolm	Leslie W. Knott
Kenneth M. Endicott	Evert A. Swensson
Malcolm J. Ford	Robert J. Anderson
James W. Hawkins	Jesse D. Harris
Glen E. Ogden	Frederick H. Hull
Rudolph F. Sievers	Raymond S. Roy
Samuel S. Spicer	James L. Southworth
William H. Stimson	William G. Budington
William B. Wiley	Gabriel P. Ferrazzano
Clarence L. Hebert	Stanley E. Krumbiegel
James A. Finger	Donald W. McNaughton
George E. Parkhurst	
John F. Oesterle	James B. Donaldson
Frederick K. Albrecht	James A. Smith
Edwin N. Hesbacher	Milton W. Gwinner
William S. Baum	Vernon W. Foster
Arnold B. Kurlander	George F. Ellinger
William F. Powell	Verne C. Waite

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, conscious of the faults and failures which mar and stain the past, we are grateful that each new week brings us to the land of beginning again. Troubled by the record of remembered yesterdays when, under the pressure of these momentous times, we fell short of our best, we are beckoned to better things by the assurance of the angel of the dawn, "Each night I burn the records of the day; each sunrise

every soul is born again." And while there comes to us a solemn realization that we cannot cancel a line of the books that are closed, we are grateful for a new week and a new day, because they are Thy gifts, bringing new vigor, new hopes, new opportunities to be strong and kind, patient and understanding, faithful and true.

Help us to command this new day, meeting its joys with praise, its difficulties with fortitude, its doubts with fidelity. Direct our steps, guard us from error, deliver us from all evil; help us to sit where others sit, seeing life's tangled skein through the eyes of those less fortunate than ourselves. So make us faithful ministers of this stricken generation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the calendar day Saturday, June 26, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scruggam
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RETURN OF SENATOR BARKLEY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in a purely personal way I want to give myself the privilege of expressing a welcome back to the Senate to the distinguished majority leader, who rejoins us this morning in full health and vigor. He has been ably represented in his absence by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who, however, I am sure will join in my expression of happiness that the old master himself has returned.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wholeheartedly join the distinguished Senator from Michigan in that sentiment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the Senator mind striking out the word "old"? [Laughter.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think the word "old" disappears of its own weakness in the physical presence of the Senator in his new youth.

I have wanted to say for some time that for many critical years the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has served his thankless task in this body with as fine a spirit, as broad a tolerance, and as tireless a devotion as could possibly be brought to his difficult assignment. It is no cinch to ride herd on Democrats. [Laughter.] I have often regretted that such talent could not be enlisted in a worthier cause, but I have never failed to appreciate his fine public service at the hottest spot in the Capitol, and I would not have wanted this morning to pass without this expression of welcome upon his return.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I express just a word of appreciation of the very cordial greeting accorded me by the Senator from Michigan, and also other Senators who have privately expressed their welcome?

I might say that I did not want to go away in the first place, but since I did

go, and the Senate, with some few exceptions, acted so wisely in my absence as it did, I began to fear that Senators had gotten along so well without me they would not want me to return at all. But I have had a very delightful rest. I have boiled out all impurities, preserving only the pure silver, whatever that may be. I have deliberately worn off a quarter of a hundred pounds, which I hope I may keep off in spite of the bean soup which is served in the Senate restaurant.

I am glad to be back, and I hope that within a week all my colleagues may take a longer recess than I have been able to have in the last month.

I want also to thank the Senator from Alabama for the very splendid way in which he has carried on the work to which I am assigned, and to express my appreciation of the skill and ability with which he has done it, and also for the cooperation which has been given to him by Members of the Senate on both sides.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION— SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who was appointed as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate on House bill 2869, dealing with the Commodity Credit Corporation, will be unable to act, and has tendered his resignation in order that the Chair may appoint a successor. I request that his resignation be accepted and that the Chair appoint his successor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resignation of the Senator from New Hampshire is accepted, and in his place the Chair appoints the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] as conferee on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication, which was referred as indicated:

CLAIM ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE—TRAVEL PAY AND ALLOWANCE, VOLUNTEERS, WAR WITH SPAIN IN THE PHILIPPINES (S. Doc. No. 85)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation amounting to \$115.68, for payment of a claim allowed by the General Accounting Office under a certificate of settlement (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission, Department of Commerce, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, requesting that no action be taken on House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246, affecting air commerce, or similar proposed legislation until the present war is over and peace is established; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 47

"Joint resolution requesting the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from Wisconsin to investigate Office of Price Administration Maximum Price Regulation No. 289 relating to cheese

"Whereas on December 24, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued and promulgated Maximum Price Regulation No. 289, the effect of which has been:

"1. The establishment of maximum prices for the various sizes of cheese produced without consideration for the increased cost of producing the smaller styles of cheese;

"2. The establishment of maximum prices for cheese on a moisture-content basis which permits the sale of cheese with low moisture content only to the Government or for processing;

"3. The establishment of maximum prices for cheese delivered outside of Wisconsin on a basis of the maximum prices for such cheese sold in Wisconsin 'plus freight from Plymouth';

"4. The establishment of maximum prices for cheese on a moisture-content basis without consideration of the trade practice of reading moisture tests in 'tenths' and adjusting the same to the nearest point or half-point; and

"Whereas all efforts of the state department of agriculture and the several cheesemakers' associations of the State, immediately recognizing in such order the difficulties and inequalities confronting those engaged in the cheese industry in Wisconsin, sought the revision of the order to the end that cheese makers in Wisconsin would not be penalized because of location, that manufacturers of the smaller sizes of cheese would be able to receive prices fairly based on cost of production, that low-moisture cheese might be sold for aging, and that there would be less interference with the attempts of the industry to increase production; and

"Whereas the Office of Price Administration did establish and promulgate Maximum Price Regulation No. 289 without consultation with either the persons engaged in the cheese industry or the State department of agriculture in Wisconsin, the State which produces more than 50 percent of the cheese manufactured in the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the United States Senators and the Representatives in Congress from Wisconsin and from other surplus-cheese-producing States, be requested to investigate the origin and supporting data of Maximum Price Regulation No. 289 issued by the Office of Price Administration, and to investigate further the possibility of the revision of such order for the protection of the cheese industry in Wisconsin; and that they report their findings to the Wisconsin Legislature; be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the two Senators and each Representative in Congress from Wisconsin."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1134. A bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941; with amendments (Rept. No. 360).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. R. 2520. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction,

extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 361).

By Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 45. A bill to further amend section 3 of Public Law No. 270, approved June 7, 1924, providing for forest perpetuation and extension, by increasing the annual authorization therefor and extending aid in combating tree insects and diseases; with amendments (Rept. No. 362).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 1130. A bill to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 363).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph T. Votava, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska; Horace Frierson, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee;

George E. Proudfit, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska; and

Reuben Gosnell, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James B. M. McNally, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Mathias F. Correa, resigned.

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Maj. Gen. Harry Clyde Ingles (colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as chief signal officer, with the rank of major general, for a period of four years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. Dawson Olmstead, chief signal officer, to be retired June 30, 1943;

Sundry officers for appointment in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law; and

Several citizens for appointment under the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA—EXPENSES OF H. C. LOWRY IN CONNECTION WITH CONTEST

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 162), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee, such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding \$381.33, for the payments of expenses incurred by H. C. Lowry in connection with the contest of the seat in the Senate from the State of North Dakota now occupied by Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1278. A bill for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co. and Equitable Fire & Marine Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1279. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; and

S. 1280. A bill to provide authority to the Secretary of War to use funds now or hereafter appropriated for adjustment of contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART (for Mr. BAILEY):

S. 1281. A bill for the relief of Rebecca A. Knight and Martha A. Christian; and

S. 1282. A bill for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. VANDENBERG introduced Senate bill 1283, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself, Mr.

WALSH, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 1284. A bill to provide for increased benefits to certain persons entitled to benefits under the act of August 16, 1941, as amended, or the act of December 2, 1942; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the subject matter of bills and joint resolutions and the manner of revising or amending laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FOOD PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION—WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill is a counterpart of the so-called Fulmer bill, introduced in the House of Representatives, to provide for centralized responsibility for the production and distribution of the Nation's food by establishing a War Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as suggested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 1283) to provide for central responsibility for the production and distribution of the Nation's food by establishing a War Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF BILL AND A RESOLUTION

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 9, one of the bills introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was erroneously referred to the Military Affairs Committee. I refer to the bill (S. 1215) to liberalize the bases of eligibility for receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War. S. 1215 proposes to amend Public Law 743 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

That law was based upon S. 134 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, a bill which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Finance. I request unanimous consent, therefore, that the Military Affairs Committee be discharged from the further consideration of S. 1215 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I also request unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of a resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, favoring removal of the statute of limitations as to claims for emergency officers' retirement benefits—heretofore presented by Mr. LINGER—and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT

Mr. LODGE. Several weeks ago I introduced a bill (S. 1131) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 so as to provide for an increase of 15 percent in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act.

From the study I have been able to give to the subject and the testimony given by officials of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, I am convinced that the bill can be materially improved. I therefore propose an amendment by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting material which I send to the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the Record at this point.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LODGE to the bill (S. 1131) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, so as to provide for an increase of 15 percent in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 101 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 381; 37 U. S. C. Supp. 201), is amended by striking out in the first and second lines the words 'of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades.'

"Sec. 2. That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words 'except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof.'

"Sec. 3. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into three classes to be known as class A, class B, and class B-1 dependents. The class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent,

grandchild, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support. The class B-1 dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for the chief portion of his support.'

"Sec. 4. That section 104 of such act is amended by inserting after the words 'class B' in the sixth and thirteenth lines, respectively, thereof the words 'or class B-1.'

"Sec. 5. That section 105 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 105. The amount of the monthly family allowance, consisting of the reduction in, or charge to, the pay of the enlisted man and the Government's contribution, payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man, shall be—

"To class A dependent or dependents:

"A wife but no child..... \$50

"A wife and one child..... 68

"(With an additional \$11 for each additional child. The total amount payable on account of two or more children to be equally divided among the children.)

"A child but no wife..... 42

"(With an additional \$11 for each additional child. The total amount payable on account of two or more children to be equally divided among the children.)

"A wife divorced..... 42

"(In no event more than the amount of alimony decreed and still payable.)

"To class B dependent or dependents (where there is no class B-1 dependent):

"Where there is no class A dependent..... \$37

"(Payable to only one designated dependent.)

"Where there is a class A dependent..... 20

"(Payable to only one designated dependent.)

"To class B-1 dependent or dependents:

"One parent but no brother or sister..... 50

"Two parents but no brother or sister..... 68

"(The total amount payable on account of two parents to be equally divided between them.)

"One parent and one brother or sister..... 68

"(With an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two.)

"Two parents and one brother or sister..... 79

"(With an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two.)

"A brother or sister but no parent.. 42

"(With an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister but not to exceed two. The total amount payable on account of two or more brothers and sisters to be equally divided among them.)

"Sec. 6. (a) That section 106 (a) of such act is amended by striking out in the sixth and seventh lines thereof the words 'both class A and class B' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'more than one class of.'

"(b) That section 106 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In any case in which the payment of the monthly family allowances involves two or more dependents, the total amount

may be apportioned and paid for the benefit of such dependents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.'

"(c) That section 106 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title—

"(1) to a wife or a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or a written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife or child shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree or in the written agreement as the amount to be paid to such wife or child, except that in the case of a wife or child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or a written agreement, and such order, decree, or agreement is silent as to the amount to be paid to such wife or child, no family allowance shall be payable unless application is made by the enlisted man or unless the secretary of the department concerned finds that it is impracticable for the enlisted man to make such application, in which case the full allowance prescribed by this title shall be paid; and except that in the case of an application filed for an allowance for a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or decree or written agreement which fixes the amount to be paid for such child's support at a lesser amount than is provided for such child by this title, the secretary of the department concerned may authorize payment of the allowance in any amount greater than that fixed by such court order, decree, or written agreement, but not in excess of the amount prescribed by this title; or

"(2) to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced.'

"Sec. 7. That section 107 of such act is amended by striking out all before the first proviso, including the word 'Provided', and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 107 (a). An initial family allowance shall be paid for the month in which an enlisted man enters a pay status in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after October 1, 1943, in the amounts and to the dependents hereinafter set forth.

"Such initial family allowance shall be paid to the designated dependent only when a written application therefor is filed by such enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service in a pay status and shall be paid as soon as practicable after the filing of such application.

"If paid, such initial family allowance shall be in lieu of the regular monthly family allowance for the month of the enlisted man's entry into active service in a pay status.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this title, the full amount of such initial family allowance shall be paid by the Government, and no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man shall be made for such payment.

"The amount of the initial family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents shall be:

"(1) \$50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) \$68, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional \$11 for each additional child;

"(3) \$42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and an additional \$11 for each additional child;

"(4) \$50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each brother

or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed \$83 in the aggregate;

"(5) \$68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed \$101 in the aggregate.

"(6) \$42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional \$11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, but not to exceed \$64 in the aggregate.

"Payment of the initial family allowance may be made to one payee for each class of dependents, as defined in section 103, for whom an allowance is requested.

"(b) The monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the first day of the month in which application therefor is filed, or the first day of the month in which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto, whichever is later, subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated or reduced, as may be required, on the last day of the month in which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man or a dependent which terminated or limited the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance: *Provided*, That the period of entitlement to family allowances shall be as hereinbefore prescribed for payment, except that in the case of a change in status of a dependent, the period of entitlement shall cease with the last day of the month in which such change occurs: *Provided further*.

"Sec. 7a. That section 108 of such act is amended by inserting in the first line thereof after 'Sec. 108,' the subparagraph designation '(a)', and adding at the end of the section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) An enlisted man receiving a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents, or who, being entitled thereto and having made application therefor on or before the date of approval of this act, may, at his option, receive or continue to receive such monetary allowance, or elect to receive in lieu thereof, the benefits of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, as amended: *Provided*, That an enlisted man's election shall be irrevocable during the period of entitlement to such allowance as set out in section 101: *Provided further*, That in the case of any enlisted man whose dependents are receiving family allowances and occupying public quarters, a deduction from or charge to his pay shall be made at the rate of \$1.25 per day."

"Sec. 8. That section 110 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 110. (a) Entitlement to and payment of any family allowance authorized under provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall not be contingent upon pay accruing to such enlisted man or upon the monthly pay of such man being reduced by or charged with any amount."

"Sec. 9. That section 119 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 119. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive, or shall attempt to solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for assisting in any manner an enlisted man or dependent in obtaining a family allowance payable under this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and for each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000, or by imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

"Sec. 10. That section 120 (c) (4) of such act is amended by striking out the words 'under oath' in the fourth line thereof.

"Sec. 11. That section 120 (i) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) The terms 'man' and 'enlisted man' mean any enlisted individual of the first to seventh grades, both inclusive, in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act and include members of the band of the United States Marine Corps, but do not include the leader and second leader of the band of the United States Marine Corps, the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan Native Guard, or band of the Navy, or the Samoan Reserve Force of the Marine Corps."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and referred as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I move that the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the importance of farmers to the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROLL-BACK OF FOOD PRICES BY SUBSIDY PAYMENTS—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, because of the parliamentary situation in respect to the Clark and Aiken amendments to the Commodity Credit bill approved on Saturday, there was no record vote indicating the views of those who, like myself, favored the O. P. A. program to roll back food prices by payment of subsidies. Along with many of my colleagues who took a similar view, I voted for the Aiken amendment as a substitute for the Clark amendment, since from my viewpoint it represented substantially the lesser of two evils. Some sections of the press, however, have mistakenly construed all votes for the Aiken amendment as votes against the O. P. A. roll-back program. I wish, therefore, to reiterate my support of that program, and in this connection to have printed as part of my remarks the text of a radio speech which I delivered last Friday evening over the Atlantic network.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the radio audience, in weighing any vital issue on the home front, I have always before me the picture and the example of brave American boys fighting our battles overseas. Every day brings a new list of casualties, dead and wounded, in your home town and mine. Every day brings new reports of incredible bravery and sacrifice.

There is no question in my mind that we will produce the food and the weapons needed by our fighting men to win a crushing victory against the Axis. We are doubly fortunate that in winning the victory, our land will not be ravaged by invading armies, nor our cities torn by falling bombs. The only question—the continuing doubt—is whether we can go through this war without the economic chaos of price inflation—inflation that would wreck the hopes of a decent live-

lihood for our boys when they come home again.

The Office of Price Administration has done a very effective job in controlling the prices of materials like steel and copper, essential to war production; in holding residential rents to pre-war levels; in maintaining the prices of articles like sugar and gasoline in common use by the average family. This is a far better record than was accomplished in the last war. But the line has not been held on many other items, especially the price of food; so that the cost of living as a whole has risen more than 25 percent since the war began.

The weekly wages of war workers have also increased, but it is not often realized that only one out of three wage earners in the country is employed in war activity. The rising cost of living is a growing hardship to at least a majority of those who work for wages or salaries, as well as the millions who live on fixed incomes from investment, pensions, or Government allowances to the families of servicemen. This growing injustice is especially acute in sections of the country like New York City, which have not shared in the general rise of war activity.

As a means of restoring a fair balance, the responsible Federal officials, acting under powers conferred by law, have taken three important steps which I heartily support:

First, they are announcing dollar-and-cents price ceilings on many retail articles—ceilings which the merchant and the customer can understand, apply, and help to enforce.

The second major step is to seek an appropriation adequate enough to fight and stamp out the black markets which threaten honest business, the consuming public, and the whole wartime food program. If we allowed all food prices to rise to the level in the black markets, the price ceiling would be the sky. I can assure you that a strong fight will be made in the Senate to restore the full Office of Price Administration budget, which means so much to the family budget in millions of American homes.

A third major step by Federal agencies was to pay reasonable subsidies in order to roll back the prices of butter and meat, without hurting the processor or the farmer. Both Great Britain and Canada have used subsidies in their very successful programs to stabilize the cost of living. And the fact is we have been using subsidies right along to stabilize many prices, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and other agencies: Consumers, manufacturers, and farmers on the east coast would be in a very bad way if we allowed the law of supply and demand to take its course on items like gasoline, coal, sugar, animal feeds, or certain vegetables for canning. These prices are being stabilized by subsidies, not by mystic powers exercised by some czar down here in Washington. With all the brave talk in Congress against subsidies, no one has proposed to wipe out all subsidies. The Senate will vote tomorrow whether to prohibit only the limited subsidies supporting the recent roll-back. If this prohibition should become law, every housewife will immediately know the difference; the price of butter will go up again by 5 cents a pound and meat prices will rise 10 percent.

The three-way program I have outlined will roll back the cost of living to the level of September 15, 1942, the level which Congress itself established last year in the Stabilization Act. What is the alternative? If this reasonable program is rejected, or crippled by final congressional action, there will be demands for increased wages, followed by demands for still higher prices—and the spiral of inflation will be in full swing. This is our gravest danger on the home front today.

Even when wages and prices are stabilized, we have to face the bigger job of mopping up surplus purchasing power. That can be done only by a coordinated drive on many fronts, to discourage spending, increase savings, and increased taxes. The one way it cannot be done is by letting prices go uncontrolled. I repeat, that is the way to economic ruin.

When we probe deeply into the causes that undermined many democracies abroad during the last decade, we see that economic collapse was brought about by the violent clash of group interests, each concerned with its own demands, regardless of the general good in time of crisis. Our crying need today is for economic stability to back up our fighting men. Let us be guided by their example—for unity, for teamwork, and for victory.

THREATENED SHORTAGE OF BEEF

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few days ago, my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] presented for inclusion in the RECORD a statement in connection with a meeting which was held recently at Fremont, Nebr., of about 800 livestock men and livestock feeders.

Since then I have received from the same group a statement which I believe will be of interest to the Members of the Senate. I ask that the statement be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The critical emergency confronting the livestock producing and feeding industry has grown rapidly more acute day by day, threatening not only the continued existence of the industry, but also the Nation's supply of its No. 1 wartime food—meat.

Due to continued failure of the Office of Price Administration, and other Government bureaus, administrations and officials, to work out a price structure which will cover cost of production of beef, the Nation faces an increasing beef shortage, despite the fact that total cattle numbers are the greatest on record.

Instead of protecting the consuming public, the Nation, and our allies by insuring an adequate supply of meat, the policies adopted to date have resulted in scarcity that threatens an actual Nation-wide meat famine in the very near future. Moreover, they are rapidly forcing the producing interests, on which future supplies depend, to the point of quitting business entirely.

This threatened meat famine is not due to any lack of willingness on the part of producers to continue their functions, but is the result of handicaps that have been placed upon them by regulations issued without knowledge, or at least without consideration, of producers' needs.

In order to rectify this situation and to restore the confidence on the part of producers that is necessary to prevent a collapse of the livestock industry and encourage future production, we, the representatives of 60 livestock producing counties in Iowa and Nebraska, offer the following recommendations:

1. A simple, positive, informed and forthright policy on the part of the Government on the production of beef is at least 12 to 15 months overdue. The present chaotic conditions in the livestock and meat industry result largely from the negative, confused, and indecisive policies followed since Pearl Harbor.

2. The uncertainty in the cattle market, aggravated by the illegal subsidy roll-back

program, continues. The light receipts of the past 2 weeks have protected the feeder to some extent. In order to promote stability in the cattle industry and to insure a regular, adequate supply of beef, it is imperative that cattle be carefully marketed as long as this uncertainty continues.

3. The first step toward improved conditions in the livestock industry is the restoration of confidence among producers in the ability of men directing Government agencies affecting the production and distribution of meat and animal products, and in their integrity and loyalty to fundamental American principles and institutions; confidence that they will use their necessarily great powers fairly and honestly and to promote the production and distribution of food in harmony with our war needs and not to secure a stranglehold on the livestock industry. The recent unfortunate proposal to use subsidies has created more confusion and still further lessened confidence in the purposes back of Government control as they affect the livestock industry. We are, unalterably, opposed to the subsidy roll-back program as proposed for the meat industry, but if we must have the roll-back we are still opposed to the subsidy.

4. We recommend that a single agency be charged with the responsibility of directing the national production, distribution, and price policies as they affect food; that the War Meat Board be given full authority to carry out its program; that every possible action be taken by the Government to keep legitimate packing plants operating and to stamp out the illegal slaughtering of livestock and marketing of meat.

5. Government policies should be directed toward the production of meat and animal products in keeping with the most efficient use of our feed resources for the prosecution of the war. A frank statement of the kind and relative amounts of meat and other animal products needed and within our probable productive capacity should be made and the reasons back of the decisions given. It is recognized that some errors may be expected, conditions may change, and modification of the program from time to time may be necessary.

6. It appears probable that our supply of feed grains in relation to our use of them has been overestimated and that it is a physical impossibility to maintain livestock production at present levels. If this is correct, the country should be apprised of the fact fully, frankly, and promptly, and not forced to reassert livestock production under the pressure of artificially manipulated prices. If readjustments in food-production programs are necessary, it should be remembered that present programs are the result of policies initiated and supported by Government agencies, and because of this fact the Government is obligated to protect the interests of producers in connection with livestock now in the process of production.

7. Consequently, changes in policies should be planned and announced far enough in advance that producers who have cooperated with the national war food production program will not be penalized nor those who have refused to cooperate benefited.

For example, the Government has an obligation to support the prices of hogs, including heavy hogs, until the fall of 1944. If feed conditions require the marketing of hogs at lighter than contemplated weights, say 220 pounds, then common honesty requires that swine producers be given the facts; present holders of heavy hogs be given time to market them; and swine producers told that after a certain date the price of hogs above a certain weight will no longer be supported by Government agencies.

If beef-cattle prices prior to the decline caused by the subsidy roll-back program were higher than justified by Office of Price Administration ceilings, the higher prices were

possible because of failure of Government regulations to function as planned or anticipated. Cattle feeders who have cattle fed on the basis of actual existing conditions should not be penalized by arbitrary, abrupt reduction in prices. Any reduction by decree in prices paid for cattle should be announced some months in advance of their effective date.

8. If available feed supplies require further modifications in cattle-feeding methods as may very well be the case, then that fact should be made public. Holders of the current crop of cattle should be protected until the cattle are marketed or time given to modify feeding methods on cattle not too far along. The weight of carcass and degree of finish desired should be stated and the price level at which carcass beef of the desired weight and finish will be supported together with ceiling prices should be made known some months in advance of effective date of such prices.

9. If beef must be produced on relatively larger amounts of roughage and relatively smaller amounts of concentrates, this should be announced as a production policy and the State experiment stations, extension services, and cattle feeders called upon to suggest possible production plans adapted to their respective States.

10. If, as seems probable, it is desirable to reduce somewhat the degree of finish of slaughter cattle, we recommend that the Office of Price Administration AA grade of beef be eliminated and the price of A grade increased to the present price of AA grade with corresponding increases for other grades and the price reflected back in the price of slaughter cattle.

11. Government officials and the consuming public should come to understand that it is only through beef cattle that a large part of our agricultural production can be made available for human needs and that governmental policies should encourage the maximum utilization of such production. This is essential if we are to be reasonably well fed.

12. The beef producer should recognize that the primary function of beef cattle is the conversion of roughages and grass to human use and that he can produce a tremendous amount of beef and other products by the proper use of grass and roughages plus a limited amount of concentrates, if the war effort requires it and if Government policies permit it.

Further, that the supply of beef can be increased and the producer kept in better position by closely culling nonproductive and long-age cows, and by the replacement of older animals of poor quality by younger animals of good quality, the use of good sires, extreme care in guarding against disease and the efficient use of feeds.

13. The Government should take the initiative in selling all classes of the American public on the idea that we are now at war; that when we divert a large part of our total production to war, normal living standards can no longer be maintained; that there are many reasons why what we buy, including food, is costing and will cost more; and that the prices of agricultural products were relatively low at the beginning of the war and should be expected to increase more than the prices of other products which were relatively higher in price at the beginning of the war.

14. Our supply of beef during the emergency depends upon the total number of cattle, available feed supplies, and Government policies. The total number of cattle is the largest on record. It is important that Government policies encourage the use of feed supplies available for cattle production to their maximum efficiency and encourage the marketing of cattle. This will insure a maximum supply of meat during the emergency and a reduction in the total number

of cattle in the United States by the end of the emergency.

HERMAN DINKLAGE,
Wisner, Nebr.
PAUL KRUGER,
Fort Calhoun, Nebr.
ALEX LEGGE,
Fremont, Nebr.
PARR YOUNG,
Murray, Nebr.
WAYLAND HOPLEY,
Atlantic, Iowa.
JAY COLEBURN,
Harlan, Iowa.
HARRY GARDNER,
Oakland, Iowa.

"THE O. W. I. IS HELPING TO WIN THE WAR"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Office of War Information Is Helping to Win the War," delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah on June 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE O. W. I.

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Movie Industry Backs the Office of War Information," written by Peter Furst, and published in PM of the issue of June 23, 1943, and an article entitled "A War Service in the Balance," written by Bosley Crowther, and published in Screen, both discussing the proposed reduction of the appropriation for the Office of War Information, which appears in the Appendix.]

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS BY CHARLES S. RUSSELL AT THE CAPITOL PAGE SCHOOL GRADUATION EXERCISES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Charles S. Russell at the Capitol Page School graduation exercises in the New House Office Building on June 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] proposing a substitute for the provision in House bill 2935 beginning in line 21, on page 65, for the liquidation of the National Youth Administration.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, several Senators who are not now on the floor wish to discuss the pending amendment dealing with the National Youth Administration. They are opposed to my views, but I think they should have a chance to be heard. The Senator from Missouri offered the amendment dealing with the National Youth Administration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I had expected that other Senators would precede me in the discussion of the pending amendment. But I am unwilling that a vote be had without taking the opportunity to give to the amendment my unqualified support. I confess without any hesitation, Mr. President, that my interest in N. Y. A. springs from some knowledge of the character of its work which has been done within my own State. In Maine N. Y. A. has had a dual program. There has been a program for local youths in local plants, and there has been a program carried on at resident centers, so-called. From these local plants and from these resident centers of Maine within less than a year's time there have gone into the industrial life of this Nation more than 1,000 trainees qualified in some branch of craftsmanship. There have gone from a single resident center, located in the home town of my distinguished colleague [Mr. BREWSTER], 1,200 trainees as welders, as machine operators, and as foundry workers of one kind or another. From them all, local plants and resident centers, Maine's branch of the N. Y. A. has contributed to the industrial life of the Nation more than 7,200 trainees, skilled, as I said a moment ago, in some useful work in the field of production.

Mr. President, there have gone from the N. Y. A. training plants of Maine sufficient numbers of aircraft workers to produce, so I am told, 18 attack bombers for every week. From these schools and from these plants there have gone into the navy yard at Portsmouth, N. H., and at Kittery, Maine, hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of parts, required in ship construction and in the outfitting of our vessels of war. There has been given this large number of new skilled workers who are making their contribution to the industrial life of the Nation, and in particular to the war production effort.

Mr. President, much the same story comes from all over the country. From some 510 communities, in which are to be found 1,500 plants of the N. Y. A., there were turned out this last year more than 400,000 trained youths. Every 7 or 8 weeks these training centers of the N. Y. A. gave to the country 16,000 welders. They gave 24,000 machinists of one character or another. They gave 11,000 persons, men and women, boys and girls, qualified as aircraft builders or otherwise qualified to contribute to the aircraft program. They turned out more than 6,500 radio operators and radio technicians. Mr. President, every day of the current year there have gone from the plants of the N. Y. A. throughout the country into the active life of America approximately 1,000 trained workers, useful workers, able to make their contribution in the immediate present, and a source of potential usefulness and of production through the long years which lie ahead.

Various objections have been urged to this amendment. It has been said that it is stripping from the centers of the country men and boys needed for our armed forces. The facts do not sustain that contention and objection.

Mr. President, 51 percent of all the trainees at the present time are girls, and 73 percent of all the trainees in all the plants of the N. Y. A. are below the military age of 18 years. The trainees are young men and young women, in large part, below military age; and the program stands as no substantial hindrance to the war effort of the country so far as manpower is concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What interests me in respect to the statement the able Senator is making is that it is asserted, at least in my area—and I presume it is a question of fact—that all the training and service done by the N. Y. A. could be with equal adequacy produced under State vocational and educational auspices. What would the Senator's comment be regarding that assertion?

Mr. WHITE. I shall come to that in a moment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. WHITE. First, I should like to refer to the fact that it has been charged that the program is stripping from the farms of America the manpower available there. The facts do not justify such an assertion. Of the 57,000 trainees at this time in the plants of the N. Y. A., only 6,600 of them come from communities of less than 2,500; and at the present time, and for some time past, no youth leaves a rural area to go to the N. Y. A. without having a certificate from the county agent of the county in which he lives that his services are not needed for farm work.

Mr. President, just a brief word further. My distinguished colleague is to answer more fully than I have attempted to do the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. However, let me make merely a passing reference to the Senator's question, because I do not want to avoid it altogether. There are 510 communities in the United States in which the N. Y. A. maintains plants. In 194 of them no comparable facilities at all are furnished by the community. In 243 of them work is carried on by joint arrangement or cooperative efforts between the N. Y. A. and school authorities, with complete satisfaction to both. In only 70 or 75 communities among the 510 in which plants are maintained by the N. Y. A. is there the slightest conflict between local authorities who want to carry on work of a similar character and the N. Y. A. authorities.

I hope what I have just said answers, for the moment, at least, the inquiry of the Senator from Michigan.

The proposed appropriation aggregates approximately \$48,000,000. The testimony is that this amount will provide for 73,000 trainees each and every month. If the program is continued during the coming year, there will be added to the industrial resources of the Nation more than 500,000 young skilled trainees.

Mr. President, much is said about economy. I am told—I heard it in the committee, and I assume I will hear it on this floor—that in behalf of economy

we must not make the suggested appropriation. I say that to strike down this agency maintained for the youth of America would not be economy but would be wanton waste of resources. To strike it down would be to throw away in substantial part all the capital expenditure which has been made; to strike it down would cause the dismantling of 1,500 plants throughout the country; it would involve the loss of machines, tools, and implements in these plants; it would cause the dissipation of the organization of personnel which has been built up; and it would deprive the youth of the country of the opportunity which is found in the program.

Mr. President, economy does not consist alone in refraining from spending of money. Economy consists as well in the wise and useful and helpful expenditure of money for beneficent purposes. To me the training of the youth of America makes a great, powerful, irresistible appeal. When mention is made to me of economy at the expense of the youth of America, I have no partnership in the appeal. I am unwilling to place on our young men and young women the dollar mark, and have it said of them that they are receiving advantages denied to others and which cannot be justified. Mr. President, I think with depression of the contrast which the proceedings today in this Chamber may afford. When the pending amendment and the pending bill are disposed of, we shall proceed to consider the appropriation bill for the Military Establishment, and scarcely a dissenting voice will be raised when the vote is taken on that bill appropriating \$72,000,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on the war. We will pass that bill in behalf of the "freedom," in behalf of our country and its institutions, in behalf of a better world. Yes, Mr. President; all this is true. But who is to pay for it all? The taxpayers will pay in the years that stretch ahead. But the immediate payment and the sacrificial payment will be made by the youth of America. They are the ones who will pay in sweat, tears, blood, broken bodies, shattered minds, and in death—and yet we will pass that bill without a moment's hesitation. But when there is proposed the expenditure of \$47,000,000 or \$48,000,000—less than one, one-hundred and fiftieth of what we will vote for war purposes—we are told that that is too much to spend in behalf of the youth of our country.

Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate in behalf of the appropriation. I want the appropriation made because it will afford to the youth of America opportunity; it will open new vistas of usefulness to them; it will make of them better men and better women. I believe in so doing. It will make for a better America. I hope the amendment will have the approval of the Senate.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I am very sorry I did not hear all the Senator's address, but I was detained at the Commerce Committee on a matter of importance.

The part of the Senator's address I heard almost leads me to believe that the Senator has the impression that we are destroying the educational system of America. Does the Senator mean to imply that during the past 150 years we have been neglecting the education of our children?

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has no right to draw such a conclusion from anything I have said. I did say that this program was an educational opportunity which it is proposed by some to destroy, and I am against its destruction.

Mr. MALONEY. If I may ask the Senator a further question, Does he not understand that vocational opportunities are provided in this country quite apart from the N. Y. A.?

Mr. WHITE. To a certain extent, but I think inadequately. This program is supplementary and complementary, and is all for the good of the country and of the youth of the country.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator agree that young men and women who are anxious to enter industry are able to obtain positions easily without going through the N. Y. A.?

Mr. WHITE. That is speculative. I know that when they go through N. Y. A. they enter industry, and I believe in vastly larger proportion, considering the numbers who take the training, than such workers are contributed by any other source.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator know that testimony before another committee indicated that only 50 percent of the N. Y. A.-trained students enter industry?

Mr. WHITE. I have heard that statement made, but the testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was that about 700 of every 1,000 entered industry.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator know—

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will continue to ask me questions, he may find something I do not know. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator have any knowledge of the extent to which the N. Y. A. youths are taken from the suburban areas of the country, where they are so badly needed on the farms, and encouraged to go into industry?

Mr. WHITE. A moment ago I said that of the 57,000 trainees now engaged in the work of the N. Y. A., only 6,600 come from communities of less than 2,500 population, and that no youth now gets into this service unless he brings to the N. Y. A. a certificate from the county agent that he is not needed in agricultural work.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator agree that a great many farm youths are leaving the farms, where they are so badly needed, to engage in this program?

Mr. WHITE. In the first place, I do not concede that any substantial number are leaving the farms to engage in this program. I think the testimony be-

fore the committee is quite to the contrary.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, do I have the floor now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). The Chair understands that the Senator from Maine has yielded to his colleague.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am very much interested to know that the Senator from Connecticut has raised this question, because hundreds of our Maine youths have gone to Connecticut to labor in the industries of Connecticut in war production, solely as a result of the training which they have received under the N. Y. A. I happen to be quite familiar with the situation. Without such assistance, I am sure that the industries of Connecticut would not have been able to make the remarkable record they have made in the production of war materials.

With respect to the broader question, which was referred to by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], as well as by the Senator from Connecticut, I do not know what the experience of other States has been; but I do know that so far as Maine is concerned—and I am sure that the same situation prevails in many other States—my observation has been that the traditional educational system has not welcomed vocational education. As a former school teacher, and as one who has served for a long time on committees on education, having been active on the committee on education of the Legislature of Maine, I know that formal education has not welcomed working with the hands. I am informed by the Senator from Michigan that in his State vocational education under State auspices has been very successful. That is certainly not true in very many other States.

I was informed by the American Federation of Labor representatives that, while, in general, they have opposed vocational education because of its conflict with the training system in the shops, they had no objection to the old-fashioned vocational education, because it did not result in training boys to do any effective work. To me that was very convincing evidence that a great development in our vocational education was essential. That is why I welcomed the development of the National Youth Administration, and the very practical work which it has carried on, supplementing our formal system. It may very well be that the two things will wisely be merged; but in this emergency, at this critical time, I view with concern the suggestion that this training program should be wiped out. I think my colleague has shown conclusively that there is very little conflict between the two systems, as a result of the National Youth Administration not being active in the areas where ample vocational training is already being provided.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I did not hear the statement of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, but in my judgment the vocational-training program under State auspices in Connecticut has been most successful. I know that some of the industrialists in my State, which is a most important industrial State, look with favor upon the continuation of the National Youth Administration. It is perfectly natural for anyone engaged in manufacturing to appreciate advanced training on the part of young people. However, the National Youth Administration was started as part of a relief program a long time ago. I think it did good work. I also think the Administration made a great many mistakes, of some of which I should be ashamed; but on the whole, I think it made a substantial contribution to the welfare of young men and women and to the efforts of Government in the depression period.

But now, taking into account the rapidly rising, tremendous national debt, I think we should be exerting every effort—I have been endeavoring to do so for some time—to abolish the so-called relief agencies. A year ago I spoke in the Senate against the National Youth Administration. Two years ago I tried to bring about its abolition. I am hopeful that at this time we may bring this agency—and soon hereafter other relief agencies—to an end, at least for the time being.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I shall yield in a moment.

I am particularly disturbed now to see Senators from agricultural States, who best understand the serious needs of agriculture and the shortage of labor on American farms, urging the continuation of a program which, day by day, under the encouragement of the National Youth Administration, is taking young men and women from the farms. A great many of them have already gone into the war program as industrial workers. Whether the N. Y. A. is continued or not, more farm youths will engage in industry, prompted partially, I am sure, by patriotism, and prompted partially, I am sure, by the belief that they can make a greater contribution to the war effort in that field than on the farm; but I am equally certain that many of them are encouraged to enter the industrial program of our country because of the high wages paid therein.

Facing the danger of a food shortage, as we are, I do not think the Federal Government should be constantly competing with itself—on the one hand appropriating money to attract young men and women to the farm, and in another part of the Government appropriating money to entice young men and women from the farm.

There are other reasons, Mr. President, why I do not like the program. I am opposed to taking young men and women—boys and girls 16 years of age—from their homes to engage in a coeducational industrial program under the auspices of the Federal Government. I deplore that part of the program.

Mr. President, because there is so much need for the saving of Federal money, I am hopeful that at this time this program may be brought to an end.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, does the Senator have the information that in the selection of youths for N. Y. A. training each youth must clear through the United States Employment Service, which must certify that he or she is not an agricultural worker, before he can engage in the N. Y. A. program?

Mr. MALONEY. In reply to the Senator from Florida, I must say that I heard that during the hearings on the bill the other day, and I was considerably surprised to know that that policy had become a part of the plan. But that does not change my opinion. I think we should be exerting every effort toward keeping young men and women on the farms. That is not what the N. Y. A. is doing.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator assume that a farm boy or girl could go to the United States Employment Service and obtain a certificate that he or she is not an agricultural worker, so as to make him or her eligible for N. Y. A. training?

Mr. MALONEY. I assume that is the case.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have anything but the word of the N. Y. A., but they have assured me in writing that that is the condition precedent to a boy or a girl obtaining this type of training.

Mr. MALONEY. I am told that that is the case now; but I do not want to have any part of it. I wish to discourage the National Youth Administration.

Mr. President, I have not seen a copy of the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], but I observed in the language of the bill as it was considered in the Appropriations Committee that provision was to be made to raise the age limit of those to receive benefits to 85 years or more. It is proposed that the N. Y. A. shall train elderly men and women who have long since passed the age which would make them eligible to receive a pension under existing law. I do not believe there is a way in which we can prove that the N. Y. A. is not useful, or that it cannot contribute to the war effort. Of course it can. It is the most flexible agency in the Government. It can change its program and change the age limits. I know the views of those who sponsor the amendment. I assume that it is intended to wipe out the age limit and to permit the N. Y. A. to train children from 16 years of age to and including children 85 years of age.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In their second childhood. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I shall not further discuss the proposal at this particular time. I may do so at a later time. I know that many Senators are anxious to speak on the subject. I believe that nearly all Senators have made up their minds how they will vote on the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I heard the distinguished Senator from Connecticut make the observation that the N. Y. A. was started to help needy students.

Mr. MALONEY. Needy youth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Needy youth. Very well. The program now includes the training of young persons who go to work in war plants. The amendment also provides for the continuation of work which they were doing in colleges.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that the appropriation bill for the War Department carries a substantial item, running into millions of dollars, for similar purposes?

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. By which persons will be trained to be doctors, veterinarians, dentists, engineers, and so forth?

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct. I am under the impression that that program will include nearly all the students who will henceforth be in college.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I wish to make is that the War Department bill carries an item for that purpose.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So there is no particular reason why that item should be included in the appropriation for the National Youth Administration.

Mr. MALONEY. As the very well informed Senator from New Mexico knows, included in this bill and other bills are large appropriations for vocational training outside the National Youth Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he departs from that point?

Mr. MALONEY. If the Senator from New Mexico has concluded, I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I was about to raise the question as to whether, in the first place, some of the benefits to students who are needy might not be for girls, who are not eligible for employment under the Army and Navy training programs—I assume generally those in the colleges—and, in the second place, for boys who, because of some physical deficiency or otherwise, are not included in the Army or Navy program.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I assume that no Senator would suggest that any boy or girl should be eligible to receive benefits both from the Army or Navy and the N. Y. A.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Those who would receive benefits under the N. Y. A. program are needy college youths who are not recipients of other Federal aid in acquiring a college education.

Mr. MALONEY. This program was originated at a time when we were disturbed over the fact that many young men and young women were suffering the loss of a college education, or the opportunity of obtaining one, because of a very serious depression which had in many cases wiped out that opportunity. Money was not available to send young men and women to college. Jobs were

not available to enable them to earn money to attend college. The purpose of this program in the beginning was to meet that need. If we vote to continue it now, in a period of plentiful employment, in a period of prosperity—so far as dollars are concerned—I have a feeling that the N. Y. A. will be with us forever. Certainly the original purposes of the N. Y. A. have been taken care of. Certainly the needs which then existed have been met. It is quite beyond me to see the justification for the National Youth Administration so long as the present period of high wages and good prices continues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] wishes to be heard.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scruggam
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdoch	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, at this time I should like to make a few remarks in favor of the Truman amendment providing an appropriation for the National Youth Administration. In this connection I wish to read some figures showing what it has done in my State. I can only speak of the success of it in my State.

The National Youth Administration in Pennsylvania during the past 12 months has maintained an average of 6,200 trainees daily. Five thousand of these get their training in local shops in 38 different communities. Twelve hundred are being trained at points to which they come from isolated communities, where no training opportunities are available, and are housed in resident centers on a 24-hour-a-day basis.

About 35 percent of these trainees are prepared in machine-shop work. Another 30 percent are being trained in heavy arc welding, and in various types of aircraft welding. The remainder are prepared for war jobs in the radio, elec-

tric, motor repair, sheet metal, and power sewing trades.

The enrollment turns over 5 to 6 times a year. Thus, in the past 12 months, some 37,000 young persons have availed themselves of war training offered through this agency. This figure represents 45 percent of the preemployment war-training output of all publicly supported training facilities in the State of Pennsylvania, including the output of the federally subsidized vocational schools. It is noteworthy that one-half of the trainees are women, and that the shops operate 2 or 3 shifts daily.

Almost 40 percent of this training is done in the anthracite coal region of northeastern Pennsylvania. It is a section of the State in which there is the largest labor surplus. It may be stated fairly that before the establishment of the war-training program of the National Youth Administration, the vocational-training opportunities of the young people of that area were so narrow and inadequate that young men were confronted with the almost single choice of entering the mines, while the needs of young women went largely unfilled.

Since 1940 the National Youth Administration has created in that anthracite region, work training facilities capable of training 3,000 persons at any one time. For the past 2 years the agency has controlled the out-migration of young workers in the area through an induction center program which relocated already trained workers in industries of North Jersey and along the lower Delaware River valley. Giant industries, such as the Baldwin Locomotive Works, the Sun Shipbuilding Co., Westinghouse Electric Manufacturing Co. of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, the Dravo Shipbuilding Corporation of Pittsburgh and Wilmington, the Radio Corporation of America in their plants at Lancaster, Pa., and Camden, N. J., the New York Shipbuilding Co. and the Middletown Airport and other Army and Navy stations have welcomed this controlled influx of already trained young people and have testified repeatedly to the value of the service rendered.

Two hundred and thirty-one National Youth Administration trainees have been employed by the Sun Shipbuilding Co. alone.

Aware of the situation in the anthracite coal region of the State, I have worked unceasingly to bring about the location of important war plants in that area, and I am happy to state, finally with some success. My colleague [Mr. DAVIS] was a member of the committee.

Among the most powerful selling arguments to induce war plants to locate in that general area has been the existence of the splendidly erected, equipped, and staffed shops of the National Youth Administration.

The largest plant to move into that section of recent date is the Murray Corporation of Detroit. While this bomber-wing assembly plant breaks ground for its giant structure, I am pleased to note that the shops of the National Youth Administration have already reached a joint arrangement with the corporation

to supply some 4,000 drillers, riveters, and sheet metal operators. This company has selected the trainees from the National Youth Administration instead of all other training sources. Within 2 weeks the National Youth Administration adjusted its floor layout to include equipment provided by the company, and at the present moment, persons are already in training against the needs of that war plant.

The National Youth Administration has demonstrated to my full satisfaction that it is efficiently managed by competent people who are imbued with great enthusiasm for the task in which they are engaged. It is a Federal agency which can stand on its record for prompt, efficient operation and for flexible administration. This year alone, 320 individual machine tools were relocated in my State in conformity with changing training needs and labor supply demands. The War Manpower Commission office of training has testified to the real service which a flexible federally operated training structure can provide during an emergency period. State and community controls necessarily impede the rapid transformation of vocational school services to meet emerging requirements. Were we to interfere with the continuance of this important activity, we should do violence both to an agency which presents us with such a record of accomplishment and to the general program of training as envisaged by the War Manpower Commission.

I cite the fact that industry in my State has sent many recommendations in support of the work which N. Y. A. shops local to its establishments are doing. No war employer has yet written me to recommend the discontinuance or reduction of present N. Y. A. operations. The Congress ordered the National Youth Administration 3 years ago to change from a work relief to a war training agency. None can deny that it has followed that mandate successfully in an incredibly short period. For this accomplishment, the Congress owes its benediction and approval, by the grant of funds necessary to go forward.

I shall now give a few samples of the type of letters industry writes concerning N. Y. A. war production training. The Piper Aircraft Corporation, of Lock Haven, Pa., has written to the shop superintendent in the war production training shop in Johnstown, Pa.:

Please let me know when you will have some more trainees available, at which time I will get in touch with Mr. Glock and make arrangements for another pooled interview.

The York Corrugating Co., of York, Pa., has written to the manager of its local N. Y. A. shop as follows:

Over a period of 2 years we have taken into our employment many boys from your sheet metal shop. We found these boys had received good training in sheet-metal work, good basic knowledge of the work, and a good background for anything needed.

These boys have been a great value to us in the execution of our war contracts, especially because of a shortage of skilled mechanics.

In order that industry in York can continue to benefit by this training, we request that the training activities will be extended.

The Manley Manufacturing Division of the American Chain & Cable Co., at York, Pa., has written to the director of the N. Y. A. shop:

As you will recall, the writer has discussed with you a number of times the fact that we are arranging to employ women in our machine shop. * * * The several times I visited your machine shop I was quite favorably impressed with the training that was given these women and with the strict attention they were giving to their work. Our experience with the several young men who were secured from your training school was such that we feel quite sure that the women we may secure from you will be well fitted to begin work in our machine shop.

I will write you again or telephone you along about the 20th, advising you definitely as to just how many women we will need and at what date.

This letter was signed by the plant manager.

The Pioneer Engineering Co., Philadelphia, has written to the Senate Appropriations Committee. The letter, signed by the plant manager, reads:

The National Youth Administration war production training shops in Philadelphia have been supplying us with workers who are trained and experienced in war production work.

We are well satisfied with these workers and we have come to depend a great deal on the National Youth Administration for workers, because National Youth Administration trainees are able to do production work with little or no additional training by us. The curtailment of the National Youth Administration during these war times, in our opinion, would seriously handicap us in obtaining trained employees as we need them.

The manager of the Goldberg Co., of Uniontown, Pa., last February wrote as follows concerning the N. Y. A. trainees employed in their plant at Uniontown:

We have been very highly pleased with the graduates of your training program whom we have employed. These boys have averaged a higher degree of skill and ability to learn than any other class of labor that we have been able to secure under the present market. Their training has been very thoroughly rounded, and as a result they are up-graded very rapidly once they come into our shop.

Mr. President, I should like to read a few other letters I found on my desk this morning. First is a letter from Reading, Pa., enclosing a resolution adopted by the city council asking that the National Youth Administration be granted the appropriation requested. The letter reads:

CITY OF READING,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Reading, Pa., June 25, 1943.

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of city council held Wednesday, June 23, 1943, that body unanimously passed Resolution 114, reciting therein that the Reading center of the National Youth Administration has been established in close proximity to this city on municipally owned land and setting forth further that since its inception this center has trained more than 1,300 young men and women in mechanical trades without in anywise interfering with, or encroaching upon, the field of endeavor of any public or private vocational training school or college.

And that the efficiency of the training bestowed is evidenced by the fact that more than 86 percent of the school students are

now successfully engaged in essential war industries; and pointing out that if it were not for the facilities offered by the Reading center of the National Youth Administration most, if not all, of the young men and women in question could not have acquired the technical skills which they are now efficiently using.

The Council of the City of Reading earnestly requests that you use your influence and best efforts to secure an appropriation sufficient to continue the National Youth Administration, especially so the Reading center, which has rendered such splendid and patriotic service, may continue in existence.

With kind personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

DANIEL F. MCKENNA,
City Clerk.

I should also like to read a letter from the principal of the New Salem public schools, as follows:

Someone said to me recently that all of us should write to Washington about stopping National Youth Administration. No doubt, we should write, but not to stop it. May I, through you, talk to every Congressman as one who has been on the firing line of this great youth movement to support the man and the National Youth Administration—the first great constructive plan ever to reach the common people and get results? I know what I am talking about, for I have administered the program in my community since it began and know at first-hand what took place.

There is just one answer to a question in this youth crisis, and that answer is to be found in killing National Youth Administration or in giving it new life. Will Congress abandon youth and let it shift for itself, or will it now give intelligent and trained leadership and direction to youth? We talk about juvenile delinquency being on the increase. No wonder! It is no accident, but direct cause and effect. If every Member of Congress had a delinquent son, we would have a big National Youth Administration. But everyone has a potential one. Do we not believe in prevention? Will we never learn? Will all these boys under 17 just automatically become great or useful citizens? Only today I had occasion to take a boy to the welding school. He was 16. Where else would I have taken him? Incidentally he had been kicked out of school because he could not pass his eighth-grade achievement test. He was branded a failure. The schools will take care of him? Didn't they? That kind of stuff is still going on and bids fair to go on forever. Shall National Youth Administration go on? Will Congress aid and give comfort to an invisible force that can destroy us as a nation from within? That is little short of treason.

Let us be practical and wise. Let us continue National Youth Administration and build into this greatest of all youth movements a new America—one that youth will want to defend.

Cordially yours,

W. O. FORMAN,
Supervising Principal.

The Baptist Ministers Conference of Philadelphia and Vicinity have written a lengthy letter endorsing the program, as follows:

BAPTIST MINISTERS CONFERENCE OF
PHILADELPHIA AND VICINITY,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 1, 1943.

Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GUFFEY: The civic committee of the Baptist Ministers Conference of Philadelphia and vicinity brought to the attention of the conference in a recent meeting the issue confronting this Congress involving

the liquidation of the National Youth Administration.

So concerned was the conference, which covers the Delaware River area from Trenton, N. J., to Wilmington, Del., representing some 250 Baptist churches and 150,000 communicants, that a resolution was passed in the regular weekly meeting, March 22, 1943, directing the writer to urge the several Congressmen and Senators from these districts to strongly support legislation for the continuation and extension of the National Youth Administration.

The members of the conference are thoroughly familiar with the work of the National Youth Administration and feel this agency is not only a pathfinder for youth but the preparation for participation in our all-out war effort will lead them to a more useful life during the peace that will follow.

Therefore, at the direction of the Baptist Ministers Conference of Philadelphia and Vicinity, I am asking you to fully support the National Youth Administration when this agency's future is brought before the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
Rev. CHARLES D. BURKE,
Secretary.

From J. Jacob Shannon & Co., of Philadelphia, I have a letter which I read, as follows:

J. JACOB SHANNON & CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 25, 1943.
Hon. United States Senator GUFFEY,
Washington, D. C.

HON. SENATOR GUFFEY: I have read this morning in the Philadelphia paper an article in regard to the National Youth Administration.

The United States Government should be congratulated for ever starting an organization of this kind.

Two years ago our company was fortunate enough to have in our employ some young men who were developed as mechanics at the National Youth school. However, since the outbreak of the war these men have been called in the Army, and we were, indeed, sorry to lose these good workers.

Congress should arrange to keep the National Youth Administration in existence for many years to come, as it is not only a great help to our youth but greater help to the country.

Very truly yours,
J. JACOB SHANNON & CO.,
M. FEICK, Secretary.

I have also a letter from Albert Lindsay Rowland, president of the State Teachers College at Shippensburg, Pa. He also endorses the movement, and states:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Shippensburg, Pa., May 11, 1943.
Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GUFFEY: As I understand it, there are two measures pending before Congress, each of which is intended to provide assistance to needy college students. Such assistance has heretofore come through the National Youth Administration and has been of inestimable value to many of our young people here who would otherwise have been unable to secure a college education.

I am naturally concerned that at this time, when accelerated programs have in many instances reduced opportunities for summer earning, there shall be no reduction in the amount of money available through the working scholarships that have heretofore been provided through the National Youth Administration.

I am not familiar in detail with either of the pending measures, but trust that any

reasonable provision for the continuance of this aid through Federal sources will have your support.

With kindest regards, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT LINDSAY ROWLAND,
President.

I have a dozen other letters, which I shall not read, but offer for the RECORD. Running all through these letters it is reiterated that the N. Y. A. conducts the only vocational schools in the State which give colored youths of our State a chance to learn essential trades.

I have, from Lawrence Foster, executive director of the Pennsylvania State Temporary Commission on the Conditions of the Urban Colored Population, some figures as to the different schools, which I will ask to have inserted at the conclusion of my remarks, following the letters to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, in closing, I should like to submit that any change in the present set-up, in my opinion, is bound to retard the training of war-production workers at a time of the Nation's greatest need of producing implements for the war.

I submit that the National Youth Administration has proven its value as a war agency, and that no jurisdictional dispute should be allowed to interfere with it as a going agency indispensable to the war effort.

The letters referred to in Mr. GUFFEY's remarks are as follows:

EBENEZER A. M. E. CHURCH,
Middletown, Pa., March 30, 1943.

Hon. Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY:

I am informed of a possible discontinuance of the National Youth Administration. Therefore, I am writing you at this time asking for your general support in this matter.

As you know, the National Youth Administration is a Federal training agency for youth geared to meet the training demands of war industries. As such, it has benefited thousands of Negro men and women throughout the length and breadth of the country. Because of the tremendous contribution made by this agency to Negro youth, I am asking you, in the interest of humanity and national unity, to support legislation for the continuance and expansion of the National Youth Administration.

The Negro has benefited largely through this great agency because it has been impartial in its accepting of registrants. It has equipped him and prepared him to qualify and take an active part in any phase of the national defense program, and enables him to meet their demands. In addition, the National Youth Administration student work program throughout the Nation has aided over 59,000 students to remain in school or complete their courses. Over 13 percent of this number were Negro students. If we are to win this war and enjoy post-war order, which will come through the coordinating of our efforts, this great agency, which stands just for these things, must not stop nor slow its speed. So I implore you, as one who can see the needs of this great, united Nation, to give it your consideration and general support.

Sincerely,

REV. J. W. GANTT.

CITY OF CARBONDALE, PA.,
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
June 21, 1943.

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been instructed to forward you a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Council of the City of Carbondale, Pa., held June 21, 1943.

Yours very truly,

MADELINE WALKER,
City Clerk.

Resolved by the Council of the City of Carbondale, That—

Whereas it is proposed by the Government to abolish the National Youth Administration, which agency has been instrumental in preparing youths to qualify for defense work; and

Whereas a great benefit has been derived from this organization;

Therefore it is for the welfare of the City of Carbondale that the National Youth Administration be retained and a copy of this resolution is directed to be forwarded to Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY and Congressman JOHN MURPHY, whereby their assistance and cooperation is solicited and requesting them to use their influence in the retention of the organization.

The advisory committee of vocational training for war production workers program for the Chester area has at all times had the fullest cooperation of the National Youth Administration shop at Ninth Street and Ridley Creek, Chester, Pa., and I have been requested as chairman of the committee to urge that this shop be continued in active operation as an aid in the training of the individuals who are to be later employed in the war industries of Delaware County.

A real contribution to the war effort in this area has been made by this training center, and with the rapid induction of men into the armed services necessitating training of additional women and older men, the training facilities in this area are taxed to capacity. It is the considered judgment of the advisory committee that nothing should interfere with the continued operation of this unit of training for war industries.

May I also add that our company's Chester branch has received valuable aid from this training shop, and we trust your committee will make appropriation so that this unit will continue all of its training functions.

R. J. WILLIAMS.

P. S.—The advisory committee referred to on the preceding page is composed of representatives of Sun Shipbuilding, Baldwin, and others.

COMMONWEALTH OF
PENNSYLVANIA,
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
West Chester, Pa., May 18, 1943.

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GUFFEY: The college student work program of the National Youth Administration has enabled many worthy students to continue their education and therefore prepare themselves for effective service who would otherwise have been unable to secure such advanced training. The proposed changes which would include war training and a 12-month program are greatly needed, and we trust they will be included in the final program.

Some of the reasons why the college work program should be continued and expanded to include the war-training and 12-month features are as follows:

First, without such a program there can be no such thing as equalization of educational opportunities for thousands of capable and

worthy youth. We must not forget that such a program does not give youth a college education but merely insures that they will have an opportunity to earn a part of the cost while at the same time continuing their education.

Second, the teacher shortage which is already critical is becoming increasingly so. Our State Department estimates a shortage of 4,000 teachers this September, and a survey by the National Education Association indicates a national shortage of 100,000. Without the National Youth Administration work program many potential teachers will be compelled to drop out of college, and thus add to the seriousness of the shortage.

Third, colleges have set up accelerated programs whereby students will complete their training in much less time, but this requires attending school the year around. However, such is impossible for many students because they have no National Youth Administration work opportunity during the summer and therefore must drop out of school to earn money for the following year. Once started to work many such students fail to return. The 12-month program would correct this deficiency.

Fourth, because of the rising cost of food, colleges have been compelled to raise the dormitory charges and this in turn has been reflected in increased applications and need for National Youth Administration employment.

Fifth, our students come for the most part from homes of low-economic income, a situation which is being further complicated by the greatly increased cost of living, and other economic dislocations resulting from the war.

As president of the State Teachers College at West Chester, Pa., and spokesman for the needs of these students, I wish to bring these facts to your personal attention, and trust you will lend your support to this worthy program.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. SWOPE,
President.

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Harrisburg, Pa., March 25, 1943.
Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to the fact that plans are being formulated to discontinue the National Youth Administration project.

As one who has been closely connected with the National Youth Administration I have had an excellent opportunity to observe the great value it has been to the training of our youth. Many of these youth are able to serve the Government and industry today simply because they were trained in National Youth Administration centers. Hundreds are still being trained in defense work and they are better equipped to do their share in winning the war.

It is my opinion that it would be a great mistake to close down a project that has done so much for our youth and is continuing to afford them an opportunity which they would not otherwise have. The National Youth Administration is essential to the war effort and is too valuable a project to scrap at this time. It has made a commendable record of achievement and is worthy of praise rather than condemnation.

Very truly yours,

MARION S. ENGLISH,
Executive Secretary.

BETHEL A. M. E. CHURCH,
Lancaster, Pa., March 27, 1943.
Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
United States Senator from
Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has reached my intelligence of the probability of the discontinuance of the

National Youth Administration. Dear sir, for such to happen will mean a calamity to the future hope of the youth of the country, especially in such crucial times.

The National Youth Administration is the instrumentality through which thousands of the youth of the Nation is trained to meet the demand of preparedness, to answer the call of the Nation's industry, in a mechanical way as well as intellectual.

Through the training provided by the National Youth Administration, thousands are now on the assembling lines in such branches as radio, drafting, machine shop, welding, sheet metal, forge, foundry, and industrial sewing and many other defense demands.

In region III, embracing Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, there are more than 15,000 youths, the majority of whom are employed in war plants during the past 7 months. The National Youth Administration students work program has aided approximately 59,000 students to remain in school or complete their courses. How can America, the wealthiest Nation of the world neglect or destroy its own future hope, when other nations in pre-war years and also now have their youths' strength geared to capacity. I have mentioned statistics, I believe are accurate.

Dear sir, I am voicing the sentiment of tens of thousands of loyal Americans, when I ask you to listen to the voice of youth. Youth is speaking, asking for a place for further preparedness in this struggle for justice and liberty, and for better service in the post-war program.

Prime Minister Winston Churchill in his masterly address on March 21, 1943, emphasized the need of individual preparedness, both mechanical and intellectual. I am asking of you when the bill pertaining to the National Youth Administration comes before the Houses of Legislature, please vote for the continuance of the National Youth Administration and the sufficient amount of appropriations to maintain it, and wield your influence among your colleagues to also vote for the continuance of the National Youth Administration.

Please reply to this communication, and I pray that it contain a hope of light for the continuance of the National Youth Administration.

I remain,

Fraternally yours,

REV. E. S. DENNIS.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE
TEMPORARY COMMISSION

ON THE CONDITIONS OF THE

URBAN COLORED POPULATION,

Philadelphia, Pa., February 27, 1943.

The Honorable JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GUFFEY: The Commission has examined the program of the National Youth Administration in Pennsylvania with particular reference to the impact upon the training and placement of Negro youth. Region III of the National Youth Administration operation includes the States of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey, but the greater portion of its program is in the State of Pennsylvania. Due to the fact that the Negro population of Pennsylvania is larger than that of New Jersey and Delaware, the majority of Negro youth trained on this program are residents of this State. The average enrollment of Negro youth trainees in this tri-State area has been approximately 1,200 with about 900 of this number residents of the State of Pennsylvania. The total assignment of Negro trainees represents approximately 18 percent of the total number enrolled in this area.

A review of placement records of the National Youth Administration shows that 1,795

Negro youth have been placed in war industries for the period July 1, 1942, to January 31, 1943. Examples of the industries in which these youth have been placed are as follows:

Philadelphia Navy Yard.....	86
Middletown Air Depot.....	20
Sun Shipbuilding Co.....	183
Dravo Corporation.....	13
Mathis Shipyards.....	10
New York Shipbuilding Co.....	21

Of particular note is the record of 719 Negro girls employed in the textile trades as power machine operators. This report of placements is significant when it is realized that without this training the greater majority of these youth would not now be employed in their present capacities. The fact that this group has benefited by this preemployment training is an outstanding reason for the continuance of this agency.

The flexibility of National Youth Administration training is demonstrated in its resident-center program which permits the transfer of trainees from communities without training facilities to well-equipped centers located near acute labor-shortage areas.

National Youth Administration training is practical because of its production-training program, fabricating useful items for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and other civilian Government agencies. In this region National Youth Administration trainees have produced during the past year for the Army and Navy ordnance a total of 918,324 articles, 86,673 of which were produced in metal shops and 791,744 garments fabricated in the industrial sewing shops. Thirty-nine thousand nine hundred and seven articles were produced in National Youth Administration woodwork shops. In addition to these there were 636,180 articles made for civilian Government agencies. Reports indicate that the articles produced met all specifications.

Added to the services to youth by the National Youth Administration is the student-work program which aids needy students through part-time employment in the schools, to continue or complete their education. Our survey discloses that in secondary schools approximately 3,300 students, of which 10 percent are Negro, are aided in colleges and graduate schools; approximately 2,600 students, of which 3 percent are Negro, benefit by this program.

Estimates of the War Manpower Commission indicate that there is still a great need for skilled and semiskilled workers in war industries. The age limitation for trainees imposed upon the National Youth Administration by your honorable body limits the effectiveness of this agency in realizing its maximum contribution to the training of workers for war industries. The Commission knows that hundreds of persons, particularly women, have applied for this training and have been turned away because of age limitations. This restriction, if lifted for the duration of the war, would insure maximum use of facilities and increase the contribution of this agency to the war effort.

Having examined the work of this agency, its efficiency and flexibility in the training of war workers, the Commission urges that this agency not only be continued but expanded to include trainees of all ages.

Respectfully submitted.

LAURENCE FOSTER,
Executive Director.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in rising to say a few words with reference to the National Youth Administration, I first wish to commend the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] for what he said on that subject.

I should like to ask the attention particularly of the Senators from Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska, to a report I have from C. B. Lund, Regional Administrator of region VIII, which I think conclusively answers the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who said a few moments ago that the National Youth movement took boys off the farms. As a matter of fact, this report shows that it has been helping boys on the farms, helping keep them there to assist in the repair of farm machinery. The report is dated June 18, and is as follows:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
St. Paul, Minn., June 18, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Congress of the United States,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: This report relative to National Youth Administration activities in region VIII is intended to further supplement the information already forwarded to your office. This report gives specific data relative to the work on the medical program of the National Youth Administration.

During the period covered in the report 40,064 youth have been given thorough physical examinations by competent physicians of the communities in which the youth live. Each examination is conducted by a physician and dentist in good standing with the State and American medical associations. The health examination is the basis for health counseling and for referring youth to their own physicians, clinics, or hospitals for remedial treatment. The complete health examination which Congress has authorized gives necessary information to meet the health needs of youth going into defense plants. Local hospitals, welfare boards, and clinics provided the National Youth Administration with X-rays, chest plates, and the services of roentgenologists, and also provided for the treatment of contagious and infectious diseases for these 40,064 youth at no cost to the National Youth Administration.

These health examinations are conducted on a basis meeting all of the State laws within each State where they are given and with the permission of parents and guardians of the youth. The examination includes past medical history, immunity status, examinations of the ears, eyes, nose, throat, lungs, circulatory system, orthopedic impairments, blood serology, and urinalysis. X-rays are given to all youth who show a positive Mantoux test. The average cost of the health examinations for these 40,064 youth has been a little less than \$2 per youth. This fee includes the services of a dentist, physician, and nurse.

The expense of the remedial work and follow-up work is borne by the youth through his National Youth Administration wages and/or his parents and/or welfare agencies or municipalities.

Through the cooperation of the various State rehabilitation departments handicapped youth have been examined and trained and placed into defense industries. In the last 6 months alone in 1 State more than 200 presumably unemployable youth of a handicapped classification have been rehabilitated and placed into defense industries.

The attached sample study of 11,000 cases indicated that 11 percent of the youth were of such physical fitness as to be ready for any type of work immediately. Fifty-three percent had health deficiencies which limited their employment in defense plants without

remedial work. Another 29 percent were found to be temporarily or permanently unfit for training or work in any kind of industry on a full-time basis. Seven percent of the youth examined were permanently unfit for any type of work or training. In other words, 89 percent of the sampling of the 11,000 youth in this region, which is made up of the States of Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska, were found to be either temporarily or permanently physically deficient for war training before receiving medical attention. Thirty percent of the youth had received remedial and follow-up assistance through their local physicians and had their deficiencies corrected prior to the time they completed their National Youth Administration training.

Attached hereto are three tables which indicate pertinent information on this subject. Should you desire further detailed information we shall be glad to prepare it for you.

Yours sincerely,

C. B. LUND,
Regional Administrator.

Attached to the report are three tables, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—Number of health examinations given to National Youth Administration youth by private physicians for period July 1, 1941, through Mar. 31, 1943

State	Number of youth examined	Male	Female
North Dakota.....	2,469	1,260	1,209
South Dakota.....	3,013	1,738	1,275
Nebraska.....	5,890	3,035	2,855
Iowa.....	12,344	6,173	6,171
Minnesota.....	16,348	10,045	6,303
Total.....	40,064	22,251	17,813

TABLE II.—Sampling of 11,000 National Youth Administration youth examined showing types of defects

Type of defect	Number	Percent of number examined
Dental.....	7,736	70.3
Eyes.....	3,528	32.0
High blood pressure.....	608	5.6
Low blood pressure.....	1,401	12.7
Overweight.....	478	4.3
Underweight.....	774	7.0
Heart.....	379	3.4
Positive Mantoux.....	1,818	16.5
X-ray.....	1,128	10.3
Positive Wassermann.....	95	.8

TABLE III.—Classification of 11,000 National Youth Administration youth based on health examinations showing fitness for employment or training

Class	Number in classification	Percent of number examined
I.....	1,168	10.6
II.....	5,812	52.8
III.....	3,131	28.5
IV.....	720	6.6
V.....	112	1.0
VI.....	57	.5
Total.....	11,000	100.0

Class I and II, fit for any work or training.
Class III and IV, limited work or physical activity.
Class V and VI, unfit for employment, training, or physical activity.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated January 9, 1942, from Robert Byrne, State youth administrator for North Dakota, addressed to me, which shows what became of these young men, some of whom were physically unfit for induction into the Army, and how they are now working in defense industries, particularly on the west coast, at Denver, Colo., and in other localities. I particularly call the Senate's attention to the fact that scores of these young men have been trained to repair farm machinery, and in view of the fact that there is so large a deficiency in farm machinery at the present time, I submit that these young men have done a great job.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 9, 1942.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am sure that you will be interested in the information which we are enclosing relative to the defense-training program of the National Youth Administration.

The bulletin, Industrial Education and the National Youth Administration Training Program, was published by the State normal and industrial school at Ellendale and outlines quite completely the work which is being done by our agency in cooperation with that institution. At the present time 50 young men are enrolled there in the specific 3-month defense-training course. The Remington Arms Co., of Denver, Colo., has agreed to accept all machine-shop trainees who successfully complete their course and are recommended by their instructors.

The National Youth Administration News Bulletin, of the Grand Forks resident center, was published by the University of North Dakota and explains in detail the work of our agency in that institution. At the present time 90 boys are receiving defense training in their shops for jobs in defense industries.

A project at Fargo, which is similar in every respect to the Grand Forks resident project, is now giving defense-work experience to 100 young men.

These projects have successfully trained upward of 400 young men, many of whom have now entered defense industries in various parts of the country. Sixty trainees are now with the Remington Arms Co. in Denver, Colo. Twenty-four from the Grand Forks project alone have now received preference rating with the Naval Reserve. Forty-four have accepted positions with the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation. Approximately 12 radio trainees have received positions with the radio merchant marine on Gallups Island, and many others have gone to defense plants in various parts of the country, including the shipyards, Boeing Aircraft Corporation, and the Rock Island Arsenal.

We are also enclosing several pictures, which will be of interest to you, of boys who are receiving training in shops in various parts of the State.

Work is rapidly being completed in Bismarck on a defense shop which will train approximately 150 young men every 3 months in machine-shop, welding, sheet-metal, and auto mechanics. We expect to commence operations at this location the early part of February.

The school men over the State have been most cooperative in assisting our agency to gage the program to meet war needs in an all-out war effort.

All projects which do not qualify as defense projects are rapidly being eliminated. Projects for girls include training in hospital work, so that the girls will be prepared for nonprofessional duties in times of emergency. Food projects have been established to give girls experience in large-quantity cooking. Clerical projects are operated in connection with selective service boards and other governmental units to give young men and women experience so that they will be prepared for jobs in civilian and military defense agencies.

You will be interested to know that information about enlistment is being distributed to all National Youth Administration projects by recruiting officers, and arrangements have been made for these officers to visit these projects for talks not only to the National Youth Administration boys but also to the other youth in the various communities where these projects are located.

The fact that the Bureau of the Budget set aside \$28,000,000 of National Youth Administration money in a reserve fund has temporarily handicapped our work. However, with the funds which remain we are doing our part in training young men and women for the defense emergency. We shall remember Pearl Harbor for one of our fine young men who was trained at our Fargo center was killed in action while serving there with the Navy.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT BYRNE,
State Youth Administrator.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report made by the War Manpower Commission, Bureau of Training, National Youth Administration, North Dakota, from which I shall read a line or two as follows:

In line with this policy, farm machinery repair courses have been offered, some of which are continuing beyond the school year.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In North Dakota, the National Youth Administration (War Manpower Commission) is operating war production training centers at three locations: Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks. The activities at these shops are geared definitely to the war effort and designed to provide trained workers for defense industries. Training and experience are offered in the fields of arc welding, machine shop, sheet metal, woodwork, and radio. The shops are equipped with standard industrial equipment, and instruction and supervision are provided by skilled tradesmen in each branch of work.

These opportunities are available to out-of-school youth between the ages of 16 to 24 inclusive. Through a special exemption, selected high school seniors have also been privileged to receive training on a part-time basis in addition to their regular high-school subjects. This means that many of these young people will soon be ready to enter war production.

Since July 1, 1942, 2,000 North Dakota young men and women have received war production training in North Dakota National Youth Administration shops. These youth come from every county in the State and each month they are taking their places in the production lines of the Nation's war industries. The majority of youth now enrolled in North Dakota National Youth Administration shops are from cities and villages. It is the policy of the National Youth Administration to encourage farm youth to remain on the farm. In line with this policy, farm machinery repair courses have been offered, some of which are continuing beyond the school year.

The majority of the North Dakota youth who have been employed in war industries are with such firms as Boeing Aircraft Co., Seattle-Tacoma Shipyards, Bremerton Navy Yards, Rock Island Arsenal, United Air Lines, and Northwest Air Lines Co. These firms speak well of our youth and praise the training offered by the National Youth Administration. As a group, the youth are very patriotic and proud of the fact that they can participate in winning the war. They do not hesitate to recognize the privilege they have been afforded in receiving such training and experience. Letters are received from these youth from day to day, expressing their appreciation and indicating the satisfaction they feel in the part which they have been permitted to play in the war effort.

During the period of training, after a youth has acquired some degree of skill, he is put on the production line in these shops, as we have orders from the Rock Island Arsenal and other governmental agencies for the production of many items needed as equipment in the Army and Navy Air Force. More than 3,000,000 such items have been produced in the shops in region VIII, of which North Dakota is a part. The estimated market value of these items is far in excess of \$3,000,000. The production work is an integral part of the training philosophy of the National Youth Administration program. While in training, the youth produce actual job orders comparable to those found in defense industry.

Aside from the splendid contributions these young people are making toward the winning of the war, there is ample evidence that the National Youth Administration has furnished them the opportunity not only of securing employment, but has also given them the satisfaction of occupying a definite place in the American way of life.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am convinced that the National Youth Administration is making a real contribution to the winning of the war. I therefore intend to support the Truman amendment providing for its continuance.

In the fiscal year now drawing to a close the National Youth Administration has given training to over 400,000 persons. That number, or even one-half that number, of semiskilled workers provided for war industry cannot be discounted. It represents an important and an indispensable contribution toward winning the war. Not less but more of this training is needed to speed the wheels of industry.

The National Youth Administration, responding to the needs of the times, has increased the number of females in training so that at the present approximately one-half of all its trainees are young women—and this proportion continues to increase, as it should and must. That is very important.

Of the males on the program only one-third are of draft age. Some of these certainly will enter the armed services without ever having used their newly acquired skills in war industry but that does not mean this training is lost, for these skills will be of great value to them in their military service.

The remainder of this group of draft age boys are those who do not quite measure up to the physical standards required by the armed forces although they are acceptable to industry and must be so in order to receive N. Y. A. training. With the training they re-

ceive they too can make their full contribution to the winning of the war.

Montana youth, as youth throughout the country, have profited by this training. Nearly a thousand of them, in large part from communities and areas where no other training facilities are available, will have received training in this fiscal year alone. As of June 9, 1943 Montana youth were preparing themselves under N. Y. A. supervision for war production as welders, sheet-metal workers, radio technicians, machine-shop workers, and as automotive mechanics.

It would require someone of greater temerity than I possess to suggest that such training makes no contribution to the war effort.

We tend to overlook the fact that our manpower problem is one of skills as well as of numbers. N. Y. A., in giving training and work experience to tens of thousands of potential war workers, is helping industry to carry its staggering burden and is rendering an invaluable contribution to the production of the implements of warfare. This is shown by the signed statements of industries engaged in war production.

On April 24, 1943, the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. sent the following letter to N. Y. A.:

"We wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your cooperation and help in sending us girls who have machine shop training at the National Youth Administration to be employed at the supercharger plant.

We find that girls with this experience and training have proven an invaluable aid in the war effort, and sincerely hope you can continue to send us girls in the future.

Then on February 10, 1943, the Studebaker Corporation sent in the following letter:

We would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation and thanks for the number of competent young women you have sent to us for employment.

They have, without exception, proved very capable and you deserve to be commended for the splendid training they are receiving at the National Youth Administration center under your careful supervision.

To make it quite clear that these letters do not all bloom in the same month, here is one from the Piper Aircraft Corporation, Lock Haven, Pa., dated December 11, 1942:

Please keep up the good work on welders, as it will be necessary for us to pick up at least 200 welders somewhere before February 1, 1943.

The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission has stated clearly and convincingly for the records that all of our training facilities must be utilized fully in the year ahead. It is counting on N. Y. A. to train approximately 600,000 persons. Perhaps before the next fiscal year ends our manpower needs may decline, but let us not be too sure about what tomorrow may bring. It may be we shall need more rather than less trainees than we now suppose. One thing in all of this is clear. We have at our command a going organization in the training field which is skilled and highly efficient. To disrupt that organization—the need for its services was never

greater—would, in my judgment, not be wise.

Nor should it be overlooked that N. Y. A. carries on its work economically—and I use the term advisedly. It pays a small wage to youth in training, as under the circumstances is proper; it houses and feeds and transports tens of thousands of them; it trains them in skills which require costly equipment and it does all of this at a total cost of only \$66.91 per month per trainee. I say that reflects superior management.

Mr. President, the facts before us show clearly that training must be provided for hundreds of thousands of persons in the fiscal year approaching. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission states that N. Y. A. is indispensable in carrying on this program. My own judgment confirms this conviction. Believing as I do that the N. Y. A. is making a vital contribution to the successful prosecution of the war effort, and doing it economically, I could not in conscience do otherwise than to approve its continuance for another year.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to give a few facts to show what the National Youth Administration is doing in my State. The National Youth Administration war production training program in Florida is preparing 1,203 youth regularly in 35 shop units at 8 locations in the State and sending them into war industries having critical labor shortages. During the year 2,358 boys and girls in Florida have gone from N. Y. A. shops to the war-production line and there are now in training approximately 1,400 who will be transferred to war industries as rapidly as they complete their training.

Mr. President, it is a matter of common knowledge that machine tools discarded by the Navy and other agencies of no further value were secured by N. Y. A., rebuilt by the youth under competent journeyman supervision and set up in shops for production work. Adjacent to the shop center in Florida, N. Y. A. built or secured resident facilities in order to bring to the shops young people living too far away to travel each day between home and the shop. Now the State has major centers located at Plant City, Pensacola, and Ocala and Miami. The State-wide Negro center in Florida is located at Daytona Beach. At the large resident centers youth are housed in dormitories, furnished food, necessary medical attention, and emergency hospitalization. The youth that obtain training at these resident centers are drawn from small towns and communities in the surrounding areas where vocational training of any kind is not available. If these facilities were withdrawn there is no possible way by which these youth can be trained.

In the selection of youth, each youth must clear through the United States Employment Service, which certifies that he or she is not an agricultural worker.

Mr. President, just before beginning to make these remarks I telephoned Mr. Aubrey Williams, the head of the National Youth Administration, and asked him particularly whether the National

Youth Administration training program was retarding the work on the farms, and Mr. Williams assured me and authorized me to state to the Senate that it was the county agent of every county who certified that the boy or girl who applied for N. Y. A. training was not needed agriculturally in the county, upon which information the United States Employment Service then certified the eligibility of the youth to the National Youth Administration. That program and that procedure have been in effect for 7 months, Mr. Williams assured me a few moments ago.

Senators will recall that the recruiting of labor is in the hands of the county agents, as representatives of the United States Extension Service, by act of Congress. So we have the protection for agriculture that the very agency responsible for the recruiting of agricultural labor must certify that the boy or girl who applies for the training is not needed upon the farms and in the agricultural-commodity producing center of the county in which he or she resides before he or she can become eligible for certification by the United States Employment Service, and then eligible for the training the National Youth Administration gives.

Therefore, Mr. President, I cannot understand why any possible detriment to agriculture will be afforded by the continuation of the training program; and I think those facts should be known and recognized as proper to the consideration of the Truman amendment for the continuation of the National Youth Administration's training program.

The 35 shop units at the 85 Florida locations mentioned will provide 707 work stations in 10 occupations having critical labor shortages, including the metal trades, welding, machine shops, sheet metal, automobile mechanics, forging, aviation mechanics, and electrical occupations. In each of the 10 occupations there are from 1 to 8 shops, and training is provided for approximately 1,200 youths at a time. Nearly half of them are girls, and the proportion of girls is constantly increasing. Each shop is set up on the basis of a production line, and is a unit in which actual work is performed. That makes it possible to train the youths under the conditions under which they will operate when they go into industry.

The training is mainly for work in the war industries; and I will say again that a few moments ago Mr. Williams assured me that every youth engaged in taking the N. Y. A. training, except those at schools and colleges, is engaged in war work or in training for war work. So the training is not incidental training, but is training of men and women and boys and girls to do war work which is essential in character.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. What is the scope of the authority of the N. Y. A. in respect to

assistance of boys and girls in schools, under present operations.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the able and humanitarian Senator from Washington has asked that question. The student work program enables students in colleges and schools to continue proper education by the performance of useful work. In my State of Florida the work the students have been able to get by virtue of the N. Y. A. program has made it possible for 1,633 Florida boys and girls to continue their education in 261 Florida institutions during the present fiscal year. The students are enrolled in secondary schools, colleges, and universities, both public and private, which are tax-exempt, non-profit-making institutions. What the student does is to get from the N. Y. A. a job that pays, as I recall, in the case of college students, an average of \$11 a month, and in the case of secondary school students, approximately from \$4 to \$7 a month. All that does is to give a boy or girl a chance to work his or her way through school or college. As a boy who never would have gotten through college if I had not had a chance to work, I know about and I appreciate that kind of a program.

Mr. BONE. Will the Senator permit me to intrude again?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BONE. Objection has been registered by some educators to the N. Y. A. program under present auspices, and I wondered what valid objection there might be to assisting a youngster who is working his way through school and who is paid for outside work. What basis could there be for that sort of objection?

Mr. PEPPER. I share the doubt suggested in the question of the able Senator as to what could be the basis of an objection to a program of this kind. The only basis I can think of is for someone to place a greater value upon money than upon the training and education of the citizenry of the Nation; and I do not so appraise those two elements.

Mr. BONE. I have not observed that the objections have been thoroughly analyzed by anyone. There seems to be an objection in certain quarters; but if it rests upon the assumption that the program will result in giving outside work to a boy so that he can work his way through college, I do not consider that a very valid objection.

Mr. PEPPER. All I can say is that some persons, unhappily, do not seem to have the same appreciation of the value of an education to the boys and girls of the Nation that the Senator from Washington and I have.

Mr. President, it also will be remembered that the boys and girls receiving N. Y. A. aid are certified by the educational institutions themselves, usually by the deans of students. So they are attested by the school, itself, to be of good character and deserving, and thus they are boys and girls who are worthy of being helped.

In the second place, they do not continue to receive the aid unless, according to the certificate of the institution itself, they do creditable work in the institution.

Mr. BONE. Is there any competitive factor of a nature which would work to the detriment of the school system?

Mr. PEPPER. There must not be; because many educational institutions in my State have requested my support of the continuation of the N. Y. A. program, and among the institutions so requesting my aid are the universities. I have never heard of an educational institution which commented other than favorably upon the continuation of the N. Y. A. college-aid program, and recommended its continuance.

Mr. BONE. Does the situation prevail in the Senator's State which exists in some other States, and I may say it exists in some spots in my State, that very important war plants now find themselves unable to secure trained help? They have sought my assistance, and doubtless they have sought the assistance of every other Member of this body who represents locations where such a condition exists. I am wondering, and probably my good friend the Senator from Florida can tell me, whether the program would lend itself to the instruction of otherwise untrained boys and men who might fill those positions.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to answer the Senator's question by referring to certificates and letters from employers engaged in war work in my State. For instance, I hold in my hand a letter from the vice president of the St. Johns River Shipbuilding Co., a company located in Jacksonville, Fla., engaged in constructing Liberty ships for the Maritime Commission. The vice president of the company says:

During the past few months it has become more evident that industry will necessarily have to employ many young women to fill the ranks depleted through young men being drafted into the armed services.

The National Youth Administration program in this State has been developing very fine trainees. It is my belief that if the age limit of 25 could be raised to 35, it would materially help, and it is with that thought in mind that I am writing you this letter.

ST. JOHNS RIVER SHIPBUILDING CO.,

KENNETH A. MERRILL, Vice President.

I now hold in my hand a copy of a letter addressed to the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, by the J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., which also is building Liberty ships for the Maritime Commission, at Panama City, Fla.

The letter reads as follows:

J. A. JONES CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.,
WAINWRIGHT YARD,
Panama City, Fla., April 28, 1943.
Hon. PAUL V. McNUTT,
Chairman, War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is written in the interest of the Pensacola war production training project, National Youth Administration, Pensacola, Fla., to acquaint you with the benefits received by the Wainwright Shipyard, J. A. Jones Construction Co., Panama City, Fla.

Since the beginning of this fiscal year, the Pensacola project has referred approximately 350 trainees in sheet metal, welding, and machine shop for employment in our shipyard. I do not need to tell you that due to labor shortage these trainees were most welcome and we wish to continue in the future receiving as many trainees as possible from the

Pensacola project. It is the hope of the personnel of our yard that the National Youth Administration training program be allowed to continue throughout the next fiscal year. We expect a sharp decrease in skilled labor to prevail within the very near future which would force us to utilize all the available training programs in this area in order to keep our yard properly staffed.

Very truly yours,

H. V. APPEN,
General Manager.

In another letter to Mr. Paul McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the same company, which employs about 12,000 workers in building Liberty ships, says:

We have secured approximately 350 youths from the National Youth Administration at Pensacola.

Listen to this testimony as to the character of the trainees:

As employees, these young men have proved very helpful to us in our production program, involving the construction of Liberty cargo ships for the United States Maritime Commission, and we earnestly trust that necessary appropriations to carry on this training will continue to be made available.

Very truly yours,

J. A. JONES CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.,
WAINWRIGHT YARD.
R. P. MAPELSDEN, Personnel Manager.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that everything the Senator has said in the statement he has made and read from the letters he has received from his constituents is accepted as being correct. The difficulty with this particular appropriation is that it duplicates the work which is being done under another item in the War Department Appropriation Act.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean in the colleges and schools?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That activity comes under the provisions of the pending amendment. That is paragraph 2 of the amendment. The objections in my State to this particular item are to paragraph 2, which has nothing to do with the item about which the Senator has been talking. Paragraph 2 is as follows—

Mr. BONE. Where is that provision?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the Truman amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. The language is:

To provide continuance of part-time employment for needy young persons in colleges and universities.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. The objection to that is that that program was started as a result of the depression. It was a very laudable program. At the time everyone was for it. The same thing is true of P. W. A. and W. P. A. Now, as a result of the war, we do not have W. P. A., P. W. A., or the Civilian Conservation Corps. The Civilian Conservation Corps was for the benefit of needy youth. It was a laudable program; but now the universities are devoting their time to training engineers, dentists, veterinarians, and doctors, and the War Department appropriation measure carries a very substan-

tial sum of money for those particular purposes. The Army and Navy, in many instances, are taking over colleges and universities as a whole to do that particular class of work. So it is felt that so long as that program is adequate, at least, some economy should be effected.

The people of my State object to items which are not necessary. They make to me this argument: The administration is continually talking about the danger of inflation. Nevertheless, you are appropriating millions of dollars for activities which are not necessary, and the result will be inflation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank my able friend for raising that question and pointing out the difficulty in his mind.

Before I began to speak on this subject I talked with Mr. Aubrey Williams, the head of the N. Y. A., about this matter. I knew that it was troubling many Senators. This is the explanation which Mr. Williams gives me, and I shall be glad to have any Senator ask questions about it:

Mr. Williams says that every boy or girl receiving N. Y. A. training in school or college is ineligible for the war-training program of the Army or Navy, to which the able Senator refers. He says that they are either girls, and therefore not eligible, or boys who are preparing to be teachers, or to do some other kind of useful work, and who are not physically qualified for the Army or Navy, and therefore are not eligible for the V-12 training program of the Army and the Navy. This is a category of needy boys and girls who are in school or college. They are found to be worthy by the institutions themselves. They are found to be doing creditable work in those institutions, and are certified by the institutions. They are not eligible for any other training program of the Federal Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand, the Senator feels that the emergency agencies which were created for the purpose of helping the needy during the depression period should be continued. He may be correct. However, in war we are taking youths from college and from the farm. The draft boards are taking youths from every field. I do not feel that it is proper, when there is so much work to be done, to continue an emergency agency such as this.

Mr. PEPPER. The emergency is that American boys and girls who are eligible for college training have not the money to obtain such training unless they are given the opportunity to work their way through school. The fact that there are shipyards in operation, and all kinds of war work going on which they could perform if they were not in school, does not mean that they do not need some kind of employment on the school campus.

I know the humane sentiments in the heart of the able Senator from New Mexico, and I know that he would not intentionally deny to 1,633 boys and girls in

my State of Florida who are presently receiving work opportunity through N. Y. A. a chance to work their way through school or college by doing odd jobs on the school campus. All that is involved in this question is an opportunity, in high school, to obtain work which will pay, on the average, from \$4 to \$7 a month, and in college, work on the campus which will pay, on the average, \$11 to \$15 a month, so that boys and girls may continue their school or college education. Bear in mind that they are not eligible, either by reason of being girls or by reason of being physically disqualified, for any of the other Federal-aid training programs.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator from Florida feels that I am humane. I am humane. The Senator from New Mexico has been the beneficiary of American institutions, the American way of thinking, and American opportunity. I want every child in America to have an opportunity, but I do not want to kill the incentive of American youth to work out its own salvation. I do not want to say to American youth that from now on it must depend upon the Federal Government for everything. Consider the membership of the United States Senate. A majority of Senators had to come up the hard way. I want to preserve opportunities for American youth. I want American youth to have some incentive. I want the American boy to realize that he must work hard. I want to help him, and I want the country to help him. However, the N. Y. A. was the creature of the Congress, created during the depression, as were the P. W. A. and many other agencies of the Federal Government. I do not think it is right to continue, under the pretext of the war effort, something which was started when people were starving and walking the streets, and when our boys were wandering idly along the highways from here to California. I do not want such an agency to continue during the war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me say one word in response—

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not want my distinguished friend from New Mexico to labor under any misapprehension about the war effort of this agency. It is one of the few agencies which have really put forth a war effort which is appreciated by the people who have to train or employ the students. The reason I offered the amendment was because Kaiser, Higgins, the Aluminum Co. of America, the automobile industry in its war effort, and half a dozen others whom I could name need the trainees which are being prepared by the N. Y. A.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not objecting to the training of boys for the war effort.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not want anyone to labor under the misapprehension that the work of this agency has not been a real war effort.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I merely desire to inquire concerning the work which is done by the particular group which was referred to by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], namely, the group that receives from \$4 to \$11 a month while they are students in school. Obviously they do not consist of the larger body of trainees for war plants. They are receiving from \$4 to \$11 a month from the Government for doing some kind of work which the Senator from Florida, as I understood him, has indicated as being work "on the campus." The expression "on the campus" naturally narrows the kind of work which they are to do. I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] provides approximately \$5,000,000 for that type of work. What is the work which is done on the campus?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is the usual kind of work which the institutions themselves have provided for students to perform. For example, one job will be work in the laboratory; another will be work in the mess hall; another will be work on the campus grounds in maintaining them in proper condition; another will be some type of work in the machine shops, and other work of that kind on the campus. It consists of all kinds of work on the campus which has been arranged by the institutions in order that students may help themselves through school or college.

Mr. BONE. Of course, there is nothing novel in that arrangement because many students in universities have worked in the office of the registrar or bursar, or performed work around the college property which had to be done. Sometimes it is manual labor, bookkeeping, or accounting work. It is quite customary. I happen to know that, having had one who was very near and dear to me who worked in the office of a university on the accounts which dealt with the payments of the salaries of the professors and work of that nature. However, I wish also to ask the able Senator from Florida what particular skills are taught in the general over-all program of work for trainees for Army plants? What field does the program cover? What type of mechanical arts and operations does it cover?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in a telephone conversation which I had a short time ago with Mr. Williams concerning the kind of training the boys and girls were receiving in the schools, he mentioned such things as chemistry, physics, engineering, and subjects of that nature. He mentioned specifically those three categories of training. He also mentioned preparation for the profession of teaching.

Mr. BONE. Then the program goes beyond the field of manual arts.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to place myself on record in support of the National Youth Administration, and particularly the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

I have personal knowledge of the satisfactory work done through this valuable training program. It would be a great mistake to discontinue it at this time.

I have received a number of telegrams and letters urging the enactment of the measure, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF
AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED ARTS,
Manhattan, June 18, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: On April 19, I wrote you at some length giving reasons why I think the College Work Program of the National Youth Administration should be continued. I believe that all of the reasons listed in the letter just referred to are equally valid at the present time.

I am familiar with the report recently gotten out under the headings of the National Education Association, the American Association of School Administrators, and the American Vocational Association. It does not seem to me worth while to prepare a report on the arguments advised in this report, but I should like to make this comment. In my opinion the major reason behind this opposition is that public school administrators are extremely reluctant to release any of their students before they graduate from high school, regardless of whether or not they could be more useful in the present emergency in doing something else. We have, for example, experienced considerable opposition from public school administrators in the widely adopted plan of permitting high school seniors to enroll in the college during this emergency.

When this matter comes up again in the Senate, as I think it likely to, I hope that you will keep these ideas in mind.

Very truly yours,

M. A. DURLAND,
Chairman Kansas College Work
Council National Youth Administration.

UNITED SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Topeka, Kans., June 18, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We would appreciate your support for the continuation of the National Youth Administration. We feel that it is the one Federal Agency that is fitting the youth of America to meet the challenge of service in the future.

We thank you in advance for your interest, not only in this, but for all of your kindnesses in the past.

Sincerely yours,

EZEKIEL RIDLEY,
Assistant U. S. O. Director.

DIOCESAN SCHOOL OFFICE,
Wichita, Kans., June 19, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator from Kansas,
United States Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: It has been brought to our attention that an effort is being made to do away altogether with the National Youth Administration and that attempts are also being made to allocate National Youth Administration funds directly to institutions instead of to needy students as in the past in case the National Youth Administration program is continued.

May we say that the work of the National Youth Administration here in Wichita has received sincere endorsement of outstanding

educational, civic, and industrial leaders with particular reference to the contribution which is being made in training young men and women to take their places in defense production. We should appreciate very much your valued support of legislation which will enable the National Youth Administration to continue its important program.

If funds will continue to be available through the National Youth Administration to enable needy and worthy students to continue their studies on the high-school and college levels, we trust that no change will be made in the manner in which the money is allocated. In the past, funds have been given directly to the students regardless of the school which they were attending. This has made it possible for them to attend not only the public schools but also privately operated high schools and colleges. If the funds are paid directly to the educational institutions it would seem that the private institutions and particularly the church-related colleges would have no share in the aid which is thus given and that none of the students attending these schools would be able to receive help through the agency of the National Youth Administration. May we solicit your support for legislation which will enable the National Youth Administration to continue to give students' aid directly to the students themselves.

Thanking you for your kind consideration in this matter, and with every good wish, we remain

Sincerely yours,
Very Rev. Msgr. LEON A. McNEILL,
Diocesan Superintendent of Education.

BAKER UNIVERSITY,
Baldwin, Kans., June 19, 1943.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I am writing you in the interest of the National Youth Administration, which has been carrying on a most worth-while program during the past few years in connection with our colleges. The feature of this program which is especially appreciated by those of us administering the affairs of privately endowed and church colleges is that the funds are paid directly to the students concerned, rather than to the institutions; in other words, the student may go where he wishes, and, if he is eligible, may be considered for employment under the National Youth Administration.

The recent report which went out from the National Education Association is not in keeping with the thing many of us would like to see accomplished. As I understand that report, it is in favor of direct Federal subsidy to institutions. I think the other method is much to be preferred. In addition, I believe that a study of the work which has been done in the colleges through the National Youth Administration appropriations will reveal that it has been a most worth-while venture and that the programs carried on have been commendable.

Here at Baker University we have the athletic stadium and field, and also many repairs to buildings about the campus which, in part, have been helped by the work made available to the students through the National Youth Administration. It is my sincere hope that the necessary appropriations will be forthcoming to make possible the continuance of the work which this agency has been carrying on.

Cordially yours,

NELSON P. HORN,
President.

FRIENDS UNIVERSITY,
Wichita, Kans., June 21, 1943.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: In these critical days, when we are making every effort to save de-

mocracy, we must not forget the longer view of saving civilization. The great hope of tomorrow rests with an educated citizenry. Therefore, I am urging you to support the National Youth Administration appropriation which will make possible the continuance of college education for a number of ambitious young men and women.

Very sincerely,

W. A. YOUNG,
President.

THE KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Emporia, June 17, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I cannot let the matter go by without registering my protest. I refer to the trend of action which seems to be coming from the committee headed by Senator BYRD. I refer to the effort to eliminate the National Youth Administration, at least that part of the National Youth Administration which is outside of colleges. I do hope that this committee and that Congress as a whole, finally, will see what a tragic thing it would be to refuse, at this time, the support of the National Youth Administration work. Many boys have been saved for a successful life, and for more than a year the National Youth Administration has done splendid work in producing tools and equipment for the defense of our country. I speak for a large number of educators in this State when I say that we are not supporting the fight made on the National Youth Administration by the unauthorized statements of the officials of the National Education Association. I believe that you take the same position we are taking on this matter, but I thought this letter might add to the testimony on the fight against the National Youth Administration.

While I am writing to you about the National Youth Administration work outside of colleges, I should like also to register my support of the bill listed under House Document 173, now being considered by a committee of Congress. It is the bill carrying support for the National Youth Administration for college work. It is no secret that college administrators and teachers all over this country are not joining the National Education Association officials at Washington in their fight against this bill. These officials of the National Education Association are acting entirely on their own and have not consulted their far-flung membership of the National Education Association throughout the Nation. Thanking you, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

H. G. LULL,
Head of Department of Education.

JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
Junction City, Kans., June 24, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to take a few moments from your busy life to talk with you concerning the wavering National Youth Administration program.

I am acquainted with it from its beginning. I have observed and supervised it at its height and at a time when it was at its low ebb. We cannot measure it in terms of its necessity for any one year. We must evaluate the past, consider the present, and be judicious for the future.

The National Youth Administration has helped innumerable boys and girls, both in the secondary schools and in colleges. It has been a means for many of obtaining the diploma or the degree. From these much constructive leadership has been developed. There might not be the demand now that there was 5 or 6 years ago, but when a boy or girl does need it, the need is very urgent and perhaps would be greater now than before to that specific person. To cut it off now might be dangerous for the future. If the

need were ever great in the future were it to be cut off now, the Congress that might rule then might not be friendly to such a program even though the need were great.

I would rather see a curtailment in the future than to have the whole program disintegrated.

To that end I am appealing to you to use your best judgment in the interest of our boys and girls.

Sincerely,

H. D. KARNS,
Principal.

The Honorable Congressman REES:

DEAR SIR: At a recent meeting of the advisory board of the National Youth Administration of Wichita, celebrating the placing of the one-thousandth graduate of their school in a war factory, it was forcibly brought home to us the contribution this agency was making to the war effort. We were informed that there had been from twenty to twenty-five thousand boys and girls placed from this agency in war work throughout this area alone. The problem of our youth in the post-war period was discussed in a very serious mood, and the group felt that some such agency should continue to function to help the youth of the Nation in the readjustment period, and unanimously passed the following resolution for your consideration:

"Whereas the National Youth Administration has done such an efficient piece of work with our youth during the depression period; and

"Whereas it is making such a wonderful contribution to the present war emergency; and

"Whereas we certainly will face an emergency in youth adjustment after the war: Be it

"Resolved, That it is the unanimous opinion of this body that the National Youth Administration should be continued and generously supported by the Congress of the United States."

Rev. L. F. Arend, chairman; H. D. Lester, vice president, Fourth National Bank, Wichita; C. W. Cor-sauf, manager, U. S. E. S.; M. M. Read, director, Sedgwick County Social Welfare Board; A. L. Ashmore, M. D.; Hugo Wall, University of Wichita; Robt. L. Nesmith, judge of district court; John P. Kieffer, president, Wichita Photo-Engravers Union, No. 73; Rev. Thomas C. Glynn, director of Catholic Youth.

ARKANSAS CITY, KANS., June 21, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,

United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge support of National Youth Administration for next fiscal year.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. F. WALKER,
Secretary.

TOPEKA, KANS., June 24, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I believe record of National Youth Administration training of essential war workers warrants continuance of that part of the program.

H. R. MILLER,
State Planning Board.

ABILENE, KANS., June 22, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your active support National Youth Administration bill as defense measure, thanks.

Mrs. J. E. JOENTZ.

TOPEKA, KANS., June 26, 1943.

Senator CAPPER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: As one of your Topeka friends, I appeal to you to help pass the National Youth Administration bill. It has done a lot of good for our Kansas boys and girls as well as playing a vital part in the war effort. My father who is president of the Topeka Food Dealers Association joins me in asking your support of the National Youth Administration bill.

Very truly yours,

J. BLOOD COATS,
GEO. E. COATS.

WICHITA, KANS., June 28, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,

Senator of Kansas, Washington, D. C.:

I believe the National Youth Administration has been of great value to the youth of this section of the country and particularly Negro youth. I truly hope you will support legislation for its support.

F. L. BARNETT,
L'OVERTURE SCHOOL.

ARKANSAS CITY, KANS., June 19, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge support of National Youth Administration appropriation for next fiscal year.

CITY COMMISSION, ARKANSAS CITY, KANS.,
GEO. W. WYLLIE, Mayor.

LINDSBURG, KANS., June 22, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Definite need for appropriation in National Youth Administration bill for college-work program. Conditions justify support on basis of need. I heartily urge your vote for it.

Dr. ERNEST F. PHILBLAD,
Former President, Bethany College.

ARKANSAS CITY, KANS., June 20, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We urge support of National Youth Administration appropriation for war training.

GEO. W. WYLLIE,
Secretary-Treasurer, Division 462,
Brotherhood Locomotive Engineers.

WICHITA, KANS., June 22, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,

United States Senator of Kansas,
United States Senate Office Building:

Pleased to inform you that National Youth Administration at Wichita is meeting with hearty approval of outstanding industries essential to production of bombers and planes. Would appreciate your support to continue this agency so vital to war industries.

BISHOP WINKELMANN.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. In response to the suggestion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], I wish to state that in my State, for instance, a school is being conducted to teach mechanical drawing to girls to fill positions in laboratories and in the engineering set-up in order to replace the young men who have been drafted into military service.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make an observation in the time of the able Senator from Florida. Whether I was in favor of or opposed to the National Youth Administration in the past, after listening

to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] make his explanation of the amendment, and after having heard him reiterate what he said a few days ago in connection with the men who are producing in this country at the present time the implements of war to defeat the enemy, I would not have any hesitancy in changing my mind.

The Truman committee is one committee of the Senate which has no ax to grind. In my opinion, the committee has the respect of the American people to a greater degree than any other committee which has been appointed in the Senate for a long time. The Senator from Missouri made an honest observation to the Senate and to the country when he proposed the amendment and asked the Senate to continue the N. Y. A. during the present emergency.

Mr. President, we are at the crossroads in this war. Great successes have taken place on the part of the Allied armies in the Pacific, in the Mediterranean, and in Tunisia.

From all reports we will soon open a second front somewhere, and soon we will make an all-out assault upon the unspeakable Japs. If there was ever a time we should do nothing that would curtail the production of implements of war or curtail the training of individuals engaged in making implements of war, it is this particular moment.

During the next 9 months the casualty list of men in the armed forces of this country will be long, and the sufferings and the heartaches of American mothers and fathers and friends will be poignant. The \$49,000,000, or whatever the amount may be required to continue the N. Y. A. should be appropriated, because, as the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] said this morning, 70 percent of the work which is now being done by these trainees eventually finds its way into war production. Mr. President, that is what I am interested in.

When we went into this war in December 1941, everyone knows that we were totally unprepared; we did not have the manpower and the mechanics and the technically trained men to do the kind of job that was so necessary then, and we are still struggling with a shortage of technical power. We have not reached the peak as yet of our production, but we will more nearly approach it as we employ the type of individual N. Y. A. is training in various schools to engage in the art of producing implements of war.

There is much loose talk about taking boys from the farm for the N. Y. A. They are not taken from the farm, unless, as the Senator from Florida said a moment ago, a certificate that they are unnecessary in the particular area is made by the proper authorities. Certainly that should satisfy any reasonable mind.

Mr. President, this is the same old fight which has been going on over the N. Y. A. for the last few years. In connection with the great emergency which confronts us incident to the war a great many persons cannot see the forest for the trees. Many seem to think that victory is just around the corner; many

seem to think that the war is over, and we sit here day after day and quibble and quarrel among ourselves when we should be lashing out in the most vigorous and effective way against the unspeakable Japs, the Nazis, and the Fascists who seek to destroy us all. We must have victory or there will be no chance for us to debate in the United States Senate in the future.

The sum involved is small in comparison with the great problems that are before us. We appropriate \$72,000,000,000 without blinking an eye, and yet we have committees consuming weeks trying to find something wrong with the National Youth Administration. Of course, it has made mistakes. It started out as a relief organization, it is true; but it has developed into a real war-effort organization. That is what I am most concerned about. I am just as much interested in economy as is any other Senator; I do not yield to any man in my attempt to protect the taxpayers of America; but, if we do not win the war, we will not have any taxpayers to protect.

I undertake to say that this is a step in the right direction toward winning the war. I am for this amendment, and I think the Senate should adopt it, because I know what the National Youth Administration in my own communities in Illinois has done toward the training of youth who without such training could not contribute anything, except in a limited way, to the war effort. The N. Y. A. has given them education along mechanical lines. It is worth while, I will say to the Senator from Washington, in my opinion. All I am interested in is in knowing that the N. Y. A. is doing something to win the war.

As to the cost of winning the war, we see the cost mount higher and higher, and, of course, every dollar we can save is that much gained, but the question of the cost of the training of individuals who will help in the war effort, who will enter factories and do necessary work, is not to be considered, in my humble opinion. When the Senator from Missouri tells the Senate that men such as Higgins and Kaiser in the shipyards and men in the other great industries who are producing the tools and instruments of war to destroy the enemy say that they want this training work continued, the Senate is listening to big business and not to the walls of some Communist outfit. An effort has been made to pin the Communist label on the N. Y. A. ever since it has been in existence. I am for the amendment; I think the Senate should adopt it and the other House of Congress should adopt it as a war effort, if nothing else.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Illinois for the very able and eloquent contribution which he has made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to beg the indulgence of the Senator from Florida for a moment. The difficulty in discussing measures of this type is that those who feel that a vote "yea" should be cast seem to think that they are the only

ones who are making any contribution to the war effort.

I have a personal interest in the winning of the war. Names of my kith and kin have been in the casualty lists; my kith and kin are prisoners of the Japs; my kith and kin are at Attu; my kith and kin are in North Africa; my kith and kin are all over the world. I also want to win the war. I want to vote for every part of this bill that has to do with advancing the war effort; but I do not wish to continue an experiment which was undertaken when the people of the country were hungry; not, however, because I do not want to win the war. I do not take my hat off to any Member of this body when it comes to the question of having relatives actually at the front trying to win the war. I am becoming sick and tired of hearing that if a Senator does not vote the way someone else thinks he should vote he is against the war. I am for winning the war, but I am against this bill unless there can be eliminated from it some features which I dislike and which I think are contrary to American institutions.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, would the Senator strike out paragraph 2?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think paragraph 2 belongs in the measure.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. We know we are facing a rather contradictory situation when we start argument on this amendment. The amendment seeks to take a going organization and expand its age limit somewhat in order to increase its effort in making preparation for war. We pay the Coca-Cola Co., of Atlanta, Ga., a large fixed fee for operating—what? A shell-loading plant, not a plant to produce a soft drink which they have been manufacturing. Why is that done? Because the Coca-Cola Co. has an existing organization. We pay to various other companies, on the recommendation of our business people, large fixed fees for operating plants. Why? Because they have an existing organization. Yet it is proposed that the Government tear down an existing governmental organization for training, at the same time it is going outside and paying private concerns because they have an organization, and then we are to build up a new organization to provide for the training. Our action seems inconsistent to me.

Mr. BONE. It is probably a fair assumption, I take it, that if a private plant puts in an educational activity it is added to the cost of the contract it has with the Government.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, it is added to the cost and, not only that, but due to the fact that there is no central government agency reaching this situation, the complaint made to me in the city of Detroit and elsewhere in industrial centers was that trainees went from school to school because there was no central organization governing the private training schools, and nothing was gained from the training in such schools because a man went from Ford to Kaiser and to General Motors and to Fisher Body,

They would leave the school at one plant and go to another because the work was pretty hard and arduous.

Mr. BONE. If a private plant establishes a school for training men and women for work in a plant, is not the cost of that operation in some fashion added to the contract for which the taxpayers have to pay?

Mr. KILGORE. Not only that but trainees are paid the wages of beginning workers during their training period.

Mr. BONE. They are paid as apprentice workers.

Mr. KILGORE. They are paid as apprentice workers.

Mr. BONE. So the cost is added to the contract because in this world it is impossible to get something for nothing.

Mr. KILGORE. A private plant always gets the benefit of the extra cost.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield while I make an observation about one phase of this subject which I think is very interesting?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I have been advised, and I have every reason to believe the information is correct, that a long time ago Mr. Hitler, who is a very forthright gentleman, undertook to bring about some very drastic changes in the educational system of Germany. Being foresighted, and realizing that he had ahead of him a program of exploitation of Europe, and realizing the part which technology plays in modern warfare—which is a very vital part, perhaps the very heart and soul and essence of modern war being the technology of it—Mr. Hitler set about to strike from the educational courses in German schools all the cultural subjects, leaving only the mechanical arts, those subjects which would make a man an efficient fighting man, with a knowledge of modern machinery, the modern machinery of war, leaving in probably merely enough of the language of Germany to enable a student in school to understand orders and to make himself an individual efficient in carrying out orders. Mr. Hitler was wise in doing that, because if he wanted to carry out his program of conquest, that was the way to build the most efficient soldiers, although of course it was a shocking thing from a cultural standpoint.

I talked to one of the able Members of this body who had been abroad, and who had talked with young German soldiers in the African theater of operations, and he said that these young fellows were very "cocky," if I may lapse into the vernacular. They said to him, I suspect thinking he was a British officer, "We are going to lick you." So my friend, who is a distinguished Member of this body, said, "Why do you think you are going to lick us?" "Well, because we have the know-how. We know how to run tanks, we understand artillery, gunnery, ballistics, mechanical drawing. We understand all those subjects which will make us efficient fighting men. We have cut out the cultural subjects in Germany over the years so as to build a more invincible army for Germany."

Mr. President, that has many shadings, many unhappy shadings, but it is

a stern lesson to us of what can be done when a great army of young men are trained almost solely and exclusively in the arts of war, and an understanding of the mechanics of war, which takes in some of the program which is embraced in the National Youth program, I take it.

I wish to ask the Senator from Florida if he can tell us what skills are being taught under the N. Y. A. general program, what subjects it covers. Part of it has been referred to by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I think very vital subjects, but in the field of mechanical arts, what are the outstanding subjects?

Mr. PEPPER. A few moments ago I mentioned, I believe, the metal trades, welding, machine-shop work, sheet-metal work, auto mechanics, forging, aviation mechanics, electrical occupations, and subjects of that character.

Mr. BONE. Those, I take it, are all vital to the war effort.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. Further information on the subject may be gleaned from a list of some of the employers who have received these trainees in Florida. Among the industries to whom the youths have been sent are the Wainwright Shipbuilding Co., Panama City, Fla.; I believe the Gibbs Dry Docks, Jacksonville, Fla.; Merrill Stevens Ship Yards, Dade County Dry Docks, Miami, Fla.; Tampa Shipbuilding Corporation, Tampa, Fla.; Eastern Air Lines, Tampa, Fla.; Pan American Airways, Communications, Inc., Miami; Food Machinery Corporation, Lakeland, Fla. They are engaged in making amphibian tanks for the war effort. In the adjoining States youths have been referred to the Alabama Dry Docks; Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation; Chickasaw Shipbuilding; Sun Shipbuilding Corporation, Chester, Pa., and so on.

Mr. President, I wish to say, in response to my able friend from New Mexico, who has expressed his sympathy with section 1 of the amendment, that is to say, the portion which has to do with training war workers, that I think he is under a misapprehension as to the reason for the establishment originally of the N. Y. A. college-aid program. It was not started as a relief measure, as the able Senator surmises. It was not a question of giving relief, in the sense of employment, to college or school boys or girls. If that had been the object, they would have been in W. P. A. It was conceived of originally as a program to aid needy and deserving boys and girls to obtain a chance, by working on the side, to finish their secondary school and college education. It was humane in its conception, but it was broad also in its aim, because it was intended to help build a better, a more educated, and a stronger citizenry for the Nation.

Mr. President, there is nothing new about what is proposed in section 2. I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico. The need exists today as it did when the N. Y. A. was initiated. There are the same boys and girls, in counterpart, who are worthy, who wish to go through high school, who wish to go through school and college, and who have not the money with which to do it. They

have to work in order to be able to finish their education. All the pending proposal would do would be to give them a chance to do honorable and wholesome work in order to complete their education.

Remember, they are certified by the school or college itself, they perform work designated by the school or college, they have to continue to do creditable work, and to be of good character, according to the certificate of the school or college, or they cannot continue to receive the benefits.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. As the Senator will remember, I think, recently there was a movement on foot among educational institutions, and various other very sympathetic-minded people, to raise a fund to put through our colleges the Japanese youths who are in the internment centers, in lieu of American youth who could not afford to go.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator for his suggestion.

Mr. President, at a time when the colleges and schools of the country are being drained of the youths, when the future of the Nation is being jeopardized by the retardation of the education of these boys and girls, perhaps by the termination of it, in the cases of many of them, if not most, surely the boys and girls who are physically, intellectually, and morally worthy of continuing in school and college are not going to be sent home because they cannot find a job on the side, averaging from \$4 to \$7 a month in the high schools, and from \$11 to \$15 a month in the schools and colleges, to help them continue to get an education.

I am sure that the able Senator from New Mexico, if he understands that these boys and girls are not eligible for any other war training program, or any other Federal aid program, and that all the proposal would do would be to give them a chance to earn a pittance on the side so as to enable them to stay in college, will not be the one, out of his magnanimous philosophy, to take those boys and girls away from their opportunity.

As a boy who fired the furnace, as a boy who rolled coal, as a boy who waited on the table, and in that way was able to go to college, Mr. President, I certainly do not want to see any boy or girl denied an opportunity to get through school by doing honorable work, and this opportunity has made it possible for 1,633 boys and girls in my State to stay in school when they otherwise could not have done so.

I know neither the able Senator from New Mexico, nor other Senators, upon reflection, will want to deny to these boys and girls such an opportunity to be more useful and valuable citizens of their country and in their work.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, about a year ago the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, held hearings on the National Youth Administration. In those hearings what impressed me most was the large number of industrialists and manufacturers who

were in the business of producing munitions and supplies and equipment for the war effort, who came before the committee asking and urging the committee to continue the N. Y. A. and its work. Many of the industrialists cited illustrations in their own plants indicating how they had been enabled to secure the needed trained workers, how they had turned to N. Y. A., and through N. Y. A. had been supplied the artisans, the mechanics, the trained men it was necessary for them to have to carry on the operation of their plants and to assure the production so necessary for our war effort.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] has said, from the very beginning of the war one of our greatest bottlenecks has been that brought about by a lack of properly trained men and women to operate the tools and machines designed to turn out the production necessary for the war.

The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Bone] inquired concerning the nature of this training, and as to the different types of work carried on by the N. Y. A. He asked, "What are these youths trained to do?" Let me give the Senate at this point a few figures.

The N. Y. A. today is a full-fledged war agency. Its entire purpose is of a character limited entirely to war purposes. It has 1,500 shops located in more than 500 communities. It has 4,300 experienced and competent trainers, teachers who are training welders, machine operators, electrical workers, radio assemblers, ship's carpenters, calkers, foundrymen, forgers, and so forth, training them at the rate of more than 1,000 each and every day.

In these 1,500 shops there is one of the greatest war-training structures we have in the whole country in all our war effort. For example, there are in use 9,739 machines of various kinds used by industry, on which 16,000 persons are being trained. There are 6,500 arc and gas welding booths, in which at this very moment 11,500 welders are being trained. There are 5,666 aircraft and other sheet-metal training units, which are at this moment training 7,680 persons. There are 3,123 radio training units, training 3,924 persons.

Mr. President, these stations are so located and are being operated in such a way as most effectively and completely to serve the war effort. For example, in the States of Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania alone there are 3,454 training units training some 6,444 persons. There are 3,236 training units with 5,386 persons in training in the States of Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. In the States of Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio there are 4,327 training units with 6,853 persons in training. In Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin there are 5,689 training units with 8,066 persons receiving training. In the States of Alabama, Florida—the State represented by the distinguished Senator who a few moments ago so eloquently and ably presented the case of N. Y. A.—Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee there are 4,460 training units with

6,337 persons at this very moment receiving training.

To dismantle those N. Y. A. plants, to put an end to the training units, to cut off the persons who are now being trained to go into war plants to produce the munitions and the supplies and the equipment necessary for our armed forces and those of our allies—to put an end to this training, Mr. President, would be to strike a severe blow at our war effort.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter addressed to me by the Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., of Mobile, Ala. For more than a year this company has been engaged in the production of ships. We know that if there be a need confronting us at this hour it is the need for ships and more ships and even more ships, because in the final analysis our war effort must depend in large measure, and does depend in large measure, upon the bridge of ships we can build to transport the supplies and the men so that they can get at the throats of our enemies. The Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., which constructs ships for the Government at Mobile, Ala., wrote to me as follows, under date of June 25, 1943, Friday of last week:

We need your assistance toward passage of an appropriation related to the National Youth Administration.

In these stringent times we are fully aware of the shortage of man and woman power that is vitally needed to prefabricate for final assembly the ships so urgently needed to supply our boys of the armed forces. A knowledge of mechanics can be gained only through association with machines and materials.

Mr. President, it makes no difference how brilliant or how gifted an individual may be, as the Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. says in its letter, the only way the individual can learn to operate the machines designed to fabricate, to weld, to do the things necessary for the building of ships, is by working with the machines. That is exactly what the N. Y. A. training program does. It places individuals at the machines and teaches them how to operate them, so they can go from the machines of the National Youth Administration to the shipbuilding plant and operate the machines in the shipbuilding plant and make their contribution to the building of ships, which are so necessary for the winning of the war.

The Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. letter continues:

We, therefore, are firmly convinced that the preparatory training that these students receive in the National Youth schools is of utmost importance and enables us to accentuate any natural adaptabilities that any individual possesses.

We are not acquainted with the activities of these schools in other localities, but we do know that over 3,000 students from Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Georgia have been placed in this shipyard area with but a very low percentage of individual failure. This, without the preparatory training received in the National Youth Administration, would be a physical impossibility.

The schools located here and in Birmingham have produced thousands of simple and complicated articles for this yard alone which

could not be produced here due to lack of facilities and manpower.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that in the N. Y. A. schools not only are the individuals trained to go into the shipyards and into the plants to carry on the work in the shipyards and in the plants, but in these very schools, as is brought out in this letter, the trainees fabricate many simple as well as complicated articles of production, which in turn are sent to shipyards and to other plants to be joined with the production of such plants and shipyards in constructing ships and the other finished products.

The letter continues:

We are now employing approximately 22,000 people in this yard and could use several thousand more trained personnel if such were available.

The company could use more. It could construct a greater number of ships; it could make a greater contribution to the winning of the war and to the winning of it in the shortest possible time if it could obtain more trained employees. What better way to give them more trained employees than, as has been suggested by the Senator from West Virginia, by keeping the organization of the N. Y. A. a going concern, continuing to develop trained workers and to provide the needed ship workers.

The letter continues:

In this present emergency our only hope of obtaining additional semi or completely trained personnel is through the medium of the National Youth Administration. It is our urgent desire that these schools, this educational program as a whole, be permitted to continue their good work for the duration of this present emergency.

Our armed forces need supplies; to obtain them we must have ships; to build ships requires trained manpower which the National Youth Administration now supplies.

Your efforts toward the passage of this new appropriation will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

ALABAMA DRY DOCK & SHIPBUILDING CO.

Mr. President, I think that company would not hesitate to let me say that it has not always supported the program of the present administration in Washington. I think I can state there have been times when it has found itself in sharp disagreement with many things which have been done in Washington, particularly with those things which it has looked upon as a part of a great social program which perhaps was bringing about too many changes and which it thought was moving too rapidly along certain lines. But that company, at Mobile, Ala., is a hard-headed, practical, common-sense concern. It wants to make its best contribution, it wants to turn out the largest possible number of ships. It knows that in order to do that job it must have trained men and trained women, and it knows that one of the best sources—in fact, as the letter states, about the only source now open to it—for trained men and women is the National Youth Administration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Johnson of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In listening to the interesting letters the Senator has just read, I noted it was stated that the National Youth Administration is the only facility for training such workers. I should be very happy to have the Senator discuss the question of duplication of effort. I want to ask if there are not other facilities for training men to do the same work.

Mr. HILL. That is undoubtedly true; but I say now to the Senator that, instead of the trouble being a duplication of facilities, the trouble is a lack of facilities. There is not sufficient training going on in the country today.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then I should like to point out to the Senator a statement contained in the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

To prove that the National Youth Administration is duplicating other bureaus in its functions, it will be necessary to examine the programs of a number of agencies performing similar duties. The War Manpower Commission has published a bulletin revealing that the following groups under its control deal with war training.

Then six programs dealing with the training of the youth of the country, doing, I take it, the same kind of training the National Youth Administration does for the youth of the country, are enumerated.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I say, the question is one not of duplication but of not having the training facilities we need. The pity is that today we should find ourselves engaged in a struggle for our very lives and not have all the training facilities which are needed in order to develop the number of trained workers it is necessary to have in order to obtain the production required for the war effort.

Mr. President, I have a number of excerpts from letters from leading business and manufacturing institutions in my State of Alabama and elsewhere in my section of the country, all of them emphasizing the need for trained workers, all of them emphasizing the splendid and necessary contribution the N. Y. A. is making toward providing trained workers. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the excerpts, but I ask unanimous consent to have them printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our needs are for welder trainees, in fact it is our greatest need as far as this company is concerned. We do not need machinists and sheet-metal workers but an increase of welders. These trainees should be 38 years of age or older in the men, and single women 18 to 35. (From Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.)

We are very appreciative of the training that has been given to the young women of this vicinity through the National Youth Training School here in Florence.

In most cases these girls that are trained and turned over to us have not been trained on our special sewing machines, but their basic training has been such that they acquire proficiency ordinarily from three to four

times as fast as those we bring in here and try to train on our own equipment. As a general rule we found these girls to be clean, punctual, and industrious.

You can see from the above that we sincerely believe in this Florence project, and since we are operating approximately 95 percent of defense work for our soldiers and sailors they are being of great use in the present emergency of national defense. (From the Gardiner-Warring Co., of Florence, Ala.)

We have received 726 of these youth who have come to us as trained welders, machinists, and sheet-metal workers. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on this fact and express the appreciation of this company for the splendid work the National Youth Administration is doing in the war effort.

I would like to inform you that we have a greater need for welders, electricians, and sheet-metal workers than we do for machinists. I am quite sure that we can use all of the trainees in the first three crafts that you can send us. (From the Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, of Mobile, Ala.)

I hope it will be possible to use the four resident units over the entire State of Mississippi to their fullest capacity on this allocated training program for specific wartime production at Higgins Industries.

I am assured that the United States Employment Service and Higgins can recruit sufficient numbers of youth to fill these four units provided you will accept and make room for them.

The organization of the aviation plant of Higgins is now taking place and we expect to use 20,000 women in the construction and assembly of planes. I hope that you will be able to house and train at least 2,000 youths for us by March, which is the time they will be needed. (From Higgins Industries, Inc., of New Orleans, La.)

Truly the National Youth Administration here in Houston in the last year or so has been of material benefit to the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, and I understand likewise to many other industries here. This benefit has come to us through what your organization has done for thousands of men and women in preemployment training. You have given these young people something that has made them valuable to us.

Our employment records show that approximately 75 percent of the 4,000 welders now working for us here have been given preliminary training by the National Youth Administration. The boys that we have hired from the National Youth Administration rolls, on the average, make better employees than welders hired from other sources. This is probably due to the fact that there has been close cooperation between the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation and the National Youth Administration, and also that the majority of your instructors have worked for us and are familiar with our welding requirements, rules, and regulations, since these are taught to National Youth Administration trainees along with their welding training.

Also, since the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation started hiring women welders, you have taken over training of these girls. To date we have hired approximately 160 women, of whom about 80 percent have come from the National Youth Administration and are proving very satisfactory.

I do not believe that any higher recommendation could be given your unit than the figures that I have quoted above. (From the vice president and general manager of the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, of Houston, Tex.)

I am taking the liberty of writing to you in regards to the National Youth Administration and what it means to my company.

I should like to point out to you how helpful the National Youth Administration has

been in assisting my company in the war effort.

Our business is and has been 100 percent defense work and we have grown continuously as production has risen, and we were forced to hire additional help. Trained help is not available; therefore, it has been a great help to find youth with a very good foundation of training in the mechanical field. Your local administration has been supplying us for the past 2 years with boys who have had preliminary training in factory work. We are still depending upon your local administration for additional help. It would be a decided loss if this useful work, which your organization is carrying on, was forced to discontinue.

For these reasons, I should certainly like to see the National Youth Administration continue for the duration. (From the president-owner of the Expert Die & Stamping Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.)

We wish to inform you that we have a number of trainees of the Charles Mill resident center near Mansfield, and find them to be among the better class of our employees both in regard to their skill and working attitudes on the job.

We feel that this program has been a very great asset to the city of Mansfield and wholeheartedly wish to indorse it and encourage its continuation. (From the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., of Mansfield, Ohio.)

Thirty-two of the National Youth Administration boys who were placed in February have received advancements in pay this month. Twenty-three of the boys who were placed in January have received two advancements in pay since they came with our company. Seven boys who reported for work in December have received three raises since they started to work.

The remaining boys were placed during the latter part of February and the first of March and from what we can learn from the departments in which they are working, they are making out all right. (From the Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md.)

This letter is written . . . to acquaint you with the benefits received by the Wainwright Shipyard, J. A. Jones Construction Co., Panama City, Fla.

Since the beginning of this fiscal year the Pensacola project has referred approximately 350 trainees in sheet metal, welding, and machine shop for employment in our shipyard. I do not need to tell you that due to labor shortage these trainees were most welcome and we wish to continue in the future receiving as many trainees as possible from the Pensacola project. It is the hope of the personnel of our yard that the National Youth Administration training program be allowed to continue throughout the next fiscal year. We expect a sharp decrease in skilled labor to prevail within the very near future which would force us to utilize all the available training programs in this area in order to keep our yard properly staffed. (From the J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who for 1 moment would consider taking a step or doing anything which would result in closing down any plant, or cause the closing down of any number of machines which were operating and producing needed war materials and war equipment. In view of the situation which confronts us today and in view of compulsion for all possible war production, no Member of the Senate would consider taking any step which would mean the closing of any plant or the disuse or displacement of machines which

now are turning out such products. Yet, Mr. President, if we strike down the N. Y. A., if we put an end to its program of training much needed men and women workers so as to enable them to go into the plants and operate the machines in them, the effect on war production will be exactly the same as if we had closed a plant or stopped the operation of some of the machines in the plants which now are turning out war products. In view of the situation now confronting our country, in view of the compelling need for war production, in view of the dire necessity for trained men and women to carry on production, I do not think any Member of the Senate can seriously consider a proposal to kill the N. Y. A., to put an end to its work, and to deny to the war effort the trained men and women who are so greatly needed in order to assure war production.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scruggs
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Willson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, with respect to my questions addressed to the able Senator from Alabama, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a portion of the report of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, beginning on page 2, under the heading "Duplication of purpose", continuing through page 3, and ending near the top of page 4.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It may be stated unequivocally that the National Youth Administration does in effect duplicate, overlap, or perform functions similar to those of six other Government bureaus as well as conduct training for which the Federal Government is already paying large sums of money to private industry. By reason of this multiple duplication of effort, manpower, equipment, and money, if for no other reason, the National Youth Administration no longer seems to justify the appropriations it receives.

To prove that the National Youth Administration is duplicating other bureaus in its functions, it will be necessary to examine the

programs of a number of agencies performing similar duties. The War Manpower Commission has published a bulletin revealing that the following groups under its control deal with war training:

1. Training Within Industry Service advises on over-all on-the-job training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through specific training programs for supervisors, instructors, and training directors.

2. Apprentice and Training Service advises on over-all training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through development of complete training programs which provide on-the-job training coordinated with the training services supplied by other agencies.

3. Vocational Training for War Production Workers (formerly Vocation Education, National Defense), United States Office of Education, in cooperation with State and local vocational schools, is specifically assigned to give training of less than college grade to war production workers.

4. Vocational Training for Rural War Production Workers, in cooperation with State boards for vocational education and local departments of vocational agriculture, is specifically assigned to give training of less than college grade in the production of farm commodities and in the repair, operation, and construction of farm machinery and equipment.

5. Engineering, Science, and Management War Training, United States Office of Education, in cooperation with colleges and universities, is specifically assigned to offer training of college grade in engineering, chemistry, physics, and production supervision to train professional and technical workers for war industries.

6. National Youth Administration is specifically assigned to provide training to unemployed, out-of-school youth between the ages of 16 and 25, in skills required in war industries.

7. The United States Employment Service is specifically assigned to deal with labor supply, make recommendations regarding training needs and on the most effective use of personnel in terms of the prevailing and anticipated labor requirements. The Employment Service will direct industry to the service assigned to give the training assistance needed.

In addition, according to testimony presented before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by Mr. Aubrey Williams, Executive Director of the National Youth Administration, it is understood that industry itself is being paid in some instances as much as 2 percent on war contracts for the specific purpose of training apprentices or recruits in courses similar to, or supplementary to, those given by the National Youth Administration and the Office of Education. The Government apparently is paying industry to train youths and men for war jobs while it is at the same time carrying on similar training programs in its own organizations.

Specifically the program of the National Youth Administration duplicates that of the Office of Education in its defense training work as well as that of those other Government bureaus and industry itself. This is evident when one compares the functions of the National Youth Administration with those of that Office. The original purpose of the National Youth Administration—to provide work relief for persons no longer in regular attendance at school—has largely been supplanted by the purpose outlined in the provisions of the appropriation act for the National Youth Administration "to provide employment and work training for unemployed young persons of the ages of 16 to 24, inclusive, on resident and nonresident workshop and other projects approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as needed

in the prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment in occupations in which there is a present or potential shortage of labor."

Similarly, the United States Office of Education assists the States in organizing and conducting vocational courses of less-than-college graduates through—

(a) Courses supplementary to employment in occupations essential to national defense,

(b) Preemployment courses, and

(c) Refresher courses for workers with some previous occupational experience.

In addition to the foregoing, the Office of Education has within its scope the following:

"To assist the States in the organization and conduct of vocational courses and related or other necessary instruction for out-of-school, rural, and nonrural persons; cooperate with the States in determining the necessary equipment and supplies to be purchased from Federal funds. Appropriate Federal funds among the States for such programs. Approve or disapprove proposed expenditures for the purchase or rental of additional equipment and rental of additional space for such programs. Administer an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to help, by loans, needy college students who can complete in 2 years their study of physics, engineering, medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy."

Obviously, then, there is a duplication of purpose in the stated objectives of the two organizations. This duplication becomes alarming when viewed from the standpoint of cost.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish briefly to discuss the pending amendment, and to preface my remarks by informing my colleagues that I am in favor of the continuation of the National Youth Administration, and to say to them also that I am a member of the subcommittee which considered this question, and also a member of the full committee which rejected the item.

Mr. President, the subcommittee approved the N. Y. A. appropriation by a very close margin. By an equally close margin the full committee rejected the N. Y. A. appropriation. Because of the closeness of the vote, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee, we have reason to believe that there is a chance in the Senate of retaining the item as presented in the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

We feel that it is not a lost cause. We believe that if the amendment shall be properly presented, there is a sufficient number of Senators with open minds to support the continuation of the National Youth Administration program.

Mr. President, I do not believe we should approach this question from the standpoint of economy alone, without going into the relation of the National Youth Administration to the Nation's war effort. I do not believe we should consider the conflict between its training program and the training program of the War Department, or that of any other agency of the Government. I believe we should consider the National Youth Administration's position in the emergency in which the country finds itself today.

First of all, the National Youth Administration is a going organization whose activities spread all over America. It is educating thousands of boys and girls, training them for war industry,

and doing a remarkable job. It is serving the war needs in our industries, and the war needs alone. It is the only agency of which I know, created before there was any anticipation of the present emergency, to fulfill a need in another field, which has fitted appropriately, effectively, and efficiently into the war effort. It is true that for a while the W. P. A. was able to do excellent work in the vicinity of camps, cantonments, and other military establishments. It is likewise a fact that the Civilian Conservation Corps was able to serve the Nation's needs in protecting forests, aqueducts, pipe lines, and other necessary facilities. But here is an agency of the Government which, in my judgment, is vitally important to the war effort. It is 100 percent in the war effort. It is one without which we can hardly get along. It is one which is more vital to the war industries of the country today than it was a month or a year ago.

As industry expands, as the skilled worker of industry is taken in the draft, as we find it necessary to recruit from the youth of the land, as it becomes necessary to employ women and girls into industry, then the National Youth Administration fits in admirably.

Mr. President, industry is expanding rapidly. Millions upon millions more personnel will be necessary in the shops, the factories, and the industries of America. Thousands upon thousands of skilled machine workers, craftsmen, artisans, and mechanics are leaving industry weekly as the result of the Selective Service Act and the needs and requirements of the military for personnel.

Mr. President, from what source are the future workers of industry to come? Will we find an adequate supply? Who will train them for this essential work? To a very remarkable degree, they will be recruited, of course, from the ranks of the female population of the country. Boys in deferred classifications will find employment in the industries of America. All of them will be unskilled. Every one of them will have to be trained. Some of them will not meet the requirements of a formal education. They will live in communities where opportunity for vocational training will not be possible in the schools of their home localities. The National Youth Administration can train many of them. With the mobility of this organization, without the standards which are required in many of the formal educational systems of the country, the National Youth Administration is the agency which can be depended upon to take care of a large group which might otherwise be untrained.

Industry cannot do the training job which will be required as a result of the large turn-over in industry, and, if industry is called upon to do the job, then thousands of machines will be utilized in training projects which ought to be utilized in making ships and tanks and guns and other equipment for war. If men and women are to be trained by an industry, then skilled workers who ought to be busily engaged in making war ma-

terial will find it necessary to drop their work and instruct the trainees.

We are going to spend approximately \$40,000,000 for the National Youth Administration, which is the most economical expenditure for obtaining skilled workers which has yet been devised. But if, in our eagerness and desire for economy, we should save \$40,000,000 and abandon the training program, it would cost the Government in excess of \$100,000,000 to train them in industry; and remember, Mr. President, whether we pay the bill in this way or in the other way, we still pay the bill.

So we find ourselves facing a very serious crisis. Industry expanding rapidly, requiring millions of additional workers, must seek workers in the ranks of those unaccustomed to labor in the fields of industry. Thousands upon thousands of skilled workers leaving industry every month, if not every week, create a new gap which must be filled. Because of the expansion of industry and also because of the gap which is to be filled as a result of the Selective Service Act, we now need every available agency, every agency at hand, to train boys and girls, men and women, wherever they may be, in order that we may fill the needs and requirements essential to the prosecution of the war.

The mobility of the national youth organization should recommend itself as readily fitted to meet the needs and requirements of this large training program. It is the only mobile training agency we have. It can be moved from one section of the country to another. Whenever a surplus exists in one training area, the National Youth Administration can transfer training work to an area where the need of a training program is imminent. Furthermore, the N. Y. A. can move its activities to an area where trainees can be found, and, after they are trained in an area where they are to be found, and yet where they may not be necessary, they can be sent across State lines and employed in industries far removed from their home area. When a given N. Y. A. school has served its purpose in any one area, it can be transferred to another area, there to continue its work.

In 1943 the N. Y. A. will have moved 25 percent of its entire set-up from one locality or one area to another. So, this mobile training agency is the only one of its kind that fits into the picture in this particular matter.

Mr. President, a question has been raised on the floor of the Senate which left the implication to many of us that the N. Y. A. was interfering with farm production, in that it was taking boys from the farms and placing them in industries. The record indicates that that is not the case. As of March 17, 1943, the N. Y. A. had only 6,000 youths who came from counties in which the largest town or city was under 2,500 in population. This does not indicate that N. Y. A. is taking youth from the farms.

Certainly I believe it will be readily agreed that other training agencies have attracted young men and young women from the rural sections of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. In my State a training school is being operated which trains young agricultural workers in the repair and maintenance of equipment and in the use of the most advanced mechanical farming equipment in order to increase the crops.

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad to have that contribution, and what the Senator says is true in many other States. The N. Y. A. is not taking youths from the farms and placing them in war industries; the N. Y. A. is training youths on the farms to do the mechanical work which is required upon the farm.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I happen to know of one case in which they did exactly what the Senator says they are not doing. I was in South Dakota at a time when there was a great shortage of farm labor. Last summer I stood on the platform of the station, and I talked to the N. Y. A. supervisor who was taking boys right off the farms in the neighborhood and sending them to Seattle to work in shipyards and get further N. Y. A. training in shipyards. There was an N. Y. A. station near Aberdeen which had been taking boys for a couple of weeks, and every one of those boys came off farms in South Dakota when there was no harvest labor available in that district. I talked to the supervisor and he told me that the boys came from there; they were put on the train on which I was traveling, and were to be trained at Seattle to work in a shipyard.

Mr. MEAD. I have no doubt that that was what was told my distinguished colleague from Ohio, but I have some doubt as to what was said to him.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, then I will yield. I say I have some doubt, because, under the law and the regulations, the county agent in every instance must approve the applications of boys who are leaving the farms for N. Y. A. training programs. Of course, if the county agent in any county approves the application of any individual, it would not be the desire of the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from New York that the applicant be denied that opportunity and be frozen in his job. I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the difficulty may be reconciled by realizing that a regulation has been put into effect since the episode to which the Senator from Ohio has referred, which I understood was last summer. I think there has been a change in the regulation to avoid the very difficulty of which the Senator from Ohio speaks.

Mr. TAFT. I said that last summer, when in fact it was denied that such a thing was being done, it was being done, for I talked to the N. Y. A. man himself. I have no confidence in a statement that

the N. Y. A. makes now or makes at any other time.

Mr. MEAD. Of course, that is a matter for each individual to determine for himself. I said I did not know but that that was what was told to the distinguished Senator, but I have some doubt about the source of the information.

Mr. President, the record is—and the record, which was made in the House and Senate hearings, speaks for itself—that only 6,000 of this huge army that is being trained came from rural counties the largest town or city of which had a population of under 2,500.

Everyone knows that male youths on the farm who are drafted can be deferred from military service; so if they desire to remain on the farm, they can do so. Everyone knows now, as the Senator from Maine well pointed out, that anyone who leaves the farm must receive the approval of the county agent. How much further we can go I do not know; but if there is any further distance we might go and write it into the bill, I should not object to it.

Mr. President, I am proud of the record as it has been made in my own State. I think a remarkable contribution has been made to the war effort, and many men and women, boys and girls would otherwise be denied the right to follow a skilled trade, would perhaps have been neglected, and would not be working in a defense plant today had it not been for the N. Y. A. program.

Almost 8,000 youths have gone into war industry in my State during the period from July 1, 1942, through February 28, 1943, from N. Y. A. training units. That is at the rate of a thousand a month. In order to serve every corner of the State, there are 21 N. Y. A. work locations, housing 59 work units, in which there are 2,599 war stations.

In my State the shop-training activities include machine, aircraft sheet metal, arc welding, gas welding, aircraft welding, forge, radio, automotive mechanics, aircraft mechanics, aircraft engine mechanics, aircraft woodwork, industrial sewing, mechanical drawing, and other shop activities. In addition, there are clerical-training activities at a few points in my State.

It can be said that the training activities are those in which there are critical labor shortages. The N. Y. A. has geared its training facilities to meet these shortages, and is concentrating all its efforts to meet industry's heavy and continuing manpower demands.

Training is of a practical nature, and gives N. Y. A. trainees not only the fundamentals of a skill but actually work experience in the production of war goods.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCRUGHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In connection with what the Senator is pointing out, not only as to the value of the training program but of its production aspect, in goods alone last year 1 navy yard received more than 1,200,000 different parts

to go into naval construction from the National Youth Administration training alone.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the Senator's contribution. Along the same line, articles produced for the Portsmouth, N. H., Navy Yard, and the Brooklyn, N. Y., Navy Yard, in my own State, which met the rigid requirements of the naval inspection service, were valued at \$78,583.50, and consumed 58,210 man-hours.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVIS. As the Senator knows, for the last 30 years I have been very much interested in the training of the youth of the land along vocational lines. The Senator has given a statement as to the number who have been trained in New York during the past 9 months. Could he give me the figures as to the per capita cost of the training of those youths in New York, or the per capita cost of training the young men and women who are being trained in the Nation as a whole?

Mr. MEAD. It is my information, according to the record, that the per capita cost was about \$108 for the full training period of 7 weeks. That is as it applies generally throughout the country.

Mr. President, more than a thousand youths from New York State who have had training in N. Y. A. shops have entered the armed services. A large proportion of these youths were reservists in the United States Signal Corps, and the training they received in the N. Y. A. training centers met with the approval of the Army officials.

A few of the firms which use N. Y. A. youths in my State are the General Electric Co., at Schenectady and Syracuse; Consolidated Slipper Co., Malone, N. Y.; American Locomotive Co., Schenectady and Auburn, N. Y.; Chevrolet Co., of Buffalo, my home city; M. J. Grass Screw Machine Products Co., of Buffalo; A. A. Johnson Machine Tool Co., Syracuse; Rome Air Depot, of the United States Army Air Corps, at Rome, N. Y.; Curtiss Wright Aviation, Buffalo, N. Y.; U. S. Hoffman Machinery Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.; Ford Brothers, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; Precision Tool and Manufacturing Co., Syracuse; Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.; Burdick & Sons Metal Works, Albany, N. Y.; International Harvester, Auburn, N. Y.; General Motors, Buffalo, N. Y.; Glenn Martin Aircraft, Buffalo, N. Y.; Bell Aircraft, Buffalo, N. Y.; Link Aviation Corporation, Binghamton, N. Y.; Remington Rand, Binghamton, N. Y.; International Business Machines Corporation, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Bausch & Lomb Co., Rochester, N. Y.; General Motors, Delco Division, Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. President, I have before me a number of letters, many of which I shall not read, but to show the type of letters and the character of the corporations writing them, I shall read briefly from one or two.

The first is from the American Locomotive Co., Diesel Engine Division, Auburn, N. Y. It is addressed to the man-

ager of the N. Y. A. Center at Auburn, N. Y. It begins with this paragraph:

We wish to take this opportunity of congratulating you on the fine work that the National Youth Administration has been doing in the training of girls. * * *

We find that girls who have had the National Youth Administration training are thoroughly conversant with the use of machine tools, blueprints, and micrometers.

The letter is signed by the personnel manager of the American Locomotive Co.

I have another letter from the Ford Instrument Co., of Long Island City, N. Y., which is addressed to Mr. Robert Ausley, National Youth Administration. They make this comment:

During recent months we have employed several hundred young men as trainees in our machine shop. Some of the most successful of these men have been National Youth Administration trained youth. * * * These men have been quite adaptable to our type of work and their records with us reflect a rather thorough mechanical training. * * *

Our company is engaged exclusively in manufacturing fire-control equipment for ships of our Navy. Our product is vitally necessary to the Nation's armament program and we are in the process of expanding our manufacturing facilities to meet the Government's needs.

I have another letter from the Ford Instrument Co., of Long Island City, N. Y., which I shall not read.

I also have a letter from the Consolidated Slipper Corporation, from which I read the following:

We have further equipment on the road and as soon as you can give us additional operators we are putting on another shift, and we can use up to 200 additional people on this work.

I read from a letter from the Columbia Aircraft Corporation of Valley Stream, N. Y.:

This is to advise that we have employed a number of trainees from your school and are pleased to mention that their services are entirely satisfactory.

I read from a letter from the David Bell Co., automatic screw machine products, of Buffalo, N. Y.:

We wish to thank you, the New York State Employment Office, and the National Youth Administration project for the splendid help you have given us in securing trained help for our machine shop.

I have a similar letter from the Swiss-American Gear Manufacturing Corporation, another complimentary epistle from Robert L. Stedman, general machine work, Oyster Bay, N. Y., also a similar letter of recommendation from the United States Hoffman Machinery Co., of Syracuse, as well as other letters. These recommendations come from what might be termed very conservative institutions, but institutions vitally interested in the success of the training program.

Mr. President, I said in the beginning of my remarks, and I now repeat, that there are a number of training programs. Each is complementing the others' efforts. Each one of them is vital to the success of our war production program; but the N. Y. A. program, with its widespread adaptability, with its

universal mobility, with its possibilities in the way of recruitment of applicants who might otherwise be denied training, reaching out as it does into every area in the country where trainees can be found, and taking those who might not have the qualifications necessary to enter other training programs, this versatile training program which is so well organized, which has contributed so splendidly to the war effort, which costs so little and which does so much, cannot be spared at this time.

Mr. President, as I have previously said, industry is rapidly expanding. Millions of workers will be necessary and they will have to be recruited from the ranks of those who are without any training of this particular type, and they will have to be found in every section of the country. Here we have an agency which can seek such persons and give them the necessary training, and make it possible for our mounting war production to continue to break all records ever established.

Mr. President, I hope and trust that the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri will be adopted so that this program may at least have an opportunity to be discussed by the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate. I hope that a majority of my colleagues in the Senate will vote for the Truman amendment, and afford us another chance to consider the merits of the National Youth Administration's work.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, while the Truman amendment is under discussion there are a few things I should like to say with reference to the attempt to eliminate a governmental agency which, from my own personal observation, has been doing a magnificent job throughout the country. Particularly I wish to speak of my observations in the State of West Virginia with respect to what it has accomplished. From July 1, 1942, to April 1, 1943, as a direct result of the training in West Virginia, 6,523 young West Virginians, most of them girls, took places in industry as trained workers in the plants, both of New England and of the Chesapeake Bay area. Those 6,523 individuals were placed in industry from sections of my State in which there was no war industry. This was a direct result in that one State alone of recruiting that number of semiskilled workers to go into the war plants in question.

As I have stated previously, we have followed the policy throughout, under the guidance of the businessmen brought to Washington to assist the W. P. B. and various other governmental agencies, of dealing exclusively in the war program with established business organizations, and, if necessary, converting a soft-drinks manufacturing organization to a shell-loading organization. We have worked on the basis of converting organizational activities to the war effort. The Truman amendment would continue that process with a governmental organization. Why should we tear down a going, flexible concern which has trained individuals whose activities had definite age limits placed upon it by Con-

gress, for Congress has limited it to persons under 25 years of age? The age ceiling should be raised so the N. Y. A. may train a greatly increased number of persons.

There are two features of the National Youth Administration's war production training program now in force which appeal to me very strongly. First, there is the payment of a subsistence wage—not a training beginner's wage, but a subsistence wage—to the trainees near their homes, so that they may be trained near home for far less money than industry is training them in industry's schools for which the United States of America is paying the bill. There is no incentive for anyone trained in a school of that kind simply to keep on in school. There is an incentive to go on into industry and make higher wages, whereas if trainees are placed on the pay roll as wage earners there is a tendency to go from school to school, as has happened in the Detroit area and in various other areas, as industrialists have informed me. Instead of going into industry they go to some other school and try to seek some other training which may benefit them more. We pay for workers but we get students.

Second. There is the resident center which makes training possible in areas where there is no local training available. I am largely interested in the normal training program of the National Youth Administration because in my State vocational schools are rare. Vocational training is offered in high schools, but due to the educational requirements placed by law on the teachers it is impossible to get practical artisans qualified to teach in such schools and it has been my experience that the training of an artisan is a matter for trained artisans.

In West Virginia 36 percent of all the N. Y. A. youths receiving training are in resident centers, because they come from communities which cannot afford to train them. With the subsistence wage they can be made self-supporting in the resident centers. Through the resident facilities the N. Y. A. is able to train and send youth to areas where the shortage of skilled and semiskilled labor is acute. More than 3,000 youth trained by N. Y. A. in West Virginia during this fiscal year have been transferred to N. Y. A. induction centers located in these critical labor demand areas.

Some of the vital war producing firms which have benefited from this arrangement are the Glenn L. Martin Co., Western Electric Co., Westinghouse Co., Maryland Drydock Co., Bethlehem Fairfield Shipyard, Edgewood Arsenal, Allied Aircraft, American Hammered Piston Ring, Eastern Aircraft Co., Bethlehem Steel Co., Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock, Norfolk Navy Yard, and Norfolk Shipbuilding and Drydock.

The managers of all those plants—and I have interviewed the managers of various ones of them during the past year—have all expressed satisfaction with the training the youth have received from the National Youth Administration.

As a matter of fact, last year so many were sent to the State of Connecticut and the State of Massachusetts that in the Baltimore area and the Norfolk area a complaint was registered against having West Virginia youth go to the New England centers, and request was made that they be held down here.

In addition to the youth trained for war industries by N. Y. A., nearly 700 other trainees have gone into the armed services where their skills are equally essential. In recognition of the importance of this training, West Virginia N. Y. A. trainees who were applicants for enlistment—about 700 in number—in the Navy were told by the Navy that they should complete their N. Y. A. courses first.

N. Y. A. training in West Virginia is carried on at seven locations which have approximately 900 work stations. On the average, those work stations are in use about two and one-half 8-hour shifts each working day. One of the stations is used exclusively for the training of women to work in clothing manufacturing establishments. I happened to meet the head of a large shirt manufacturing company which has a large Army contract, and he told me he had made a blanket application for all the N. Y. A. workers he could obtain.

Youth are drawn from all the counties in the State to the training centers where they are given training in the various mechanical fields which are in demand in war industry. Trainees are supervised and instructed by industrially experienced foremen. In other words, the trainees are trained by practical workmen.

N. Y. A. shops are operated on a production basis and the trainees learn their skills in a shop atmosphere. Some of the articles made by N. Y. A. trainees in West Virginia during this fiscal year, at a great saving to the Government, are:

Ten thousand loading pallets for the United States Army. Loading pallets, sometimes called lift boards, are the wooden pallets which are used in loading ships. By their use the loading time for ships in port, when being loaded by the Army, has been reduced 25 percent.

Twenty thousand cooks' and bakers' uniforms for the United States Army Quartermaster Corps.

Ten torpedo adjusting stands for the Navy torpedo station, Alexandria, Va. Those stands are rather delicate, and are difficult to make.

Ten thousand four hundred and ninety-six steel Army cots for the United States Army Quartermaster Corps. I happen to be familiar with that item, because in the last fiscal year the N. Y. A. trainees made over 16,000 such cots for the United States Army. The cots cost the Army \$2.58 apiece, as compared to an average cost of \$6.85 for the cots when made commercially. In other words, the difference in cost was recaptured by the Army from the money spent for the training of those youths. The time of the youths was employed in making something useful for the Army.

Three hundred and sixteen radio converters for the Civil Air Patrol. Three

thousand two hundred first-aid kits for the State of West Virginia. Ten inter-office communicating system sets for the State. Five hundred and forty cartridge containers for the Philadelphia Ordnance Depot. Two gun mounts for the United States Naval Ordnance Depot, which is right next to the shops.

Fifteen extractor curb caps for the Ordnance Depot, Radford, Va. Six thousand metal fire rakes for the Forestry Service, for use in combating forest fires. There was a scarcity of such implements.

Twelve hundred ship ladders, 100 hulls, for the United States Maritime Commission.

All those items, so far as labor costs went, represented a recapture of funds from the funds paid out for the N. Y. A., because the labor cost nothing. The training was used to produce useful articles.

In reviewing the accomplishments of the National Youth Administration I am deeply impressed with the services it has rendered and is rendering the war effort, from all I have seen and heard, not only in West Virginia but elsewhere in the country. I have talked to Mr. Bedford, who handles four shipyards for Mr. Kaiser and who expresses himself as highly pleased with the trainees he has received. I know the attitude of that organization toward N. Y. A. trainees. I have talked to various other large organizations. Some time ago the Glenn Martin Co. had in its plant over 700 N. Y. A. trainees from the one State of West Virginia.

It is clear to me that our present need for production is so great that it is necessary to get the maximum skill, and we should get it back home where the cost is least and then ship the trainees, after they are semitrained, to plants where their training may be completed.

I was told by the manager of a gun plant in West Virginia which is next door to one of the training schools that it took just one shift for one of the trainees to take over work on any machine tool in the shop. After he came out of school, one shift to familiarize himself with the operation of the particular machine tool qualified him to go ahead as a first-class workman on that tool. In my opinion, training of that kind is something we must have.

Unless the N. Y. A. is retained I believe we will handicap the training program; we will hamper the supply of our future needs; we will make the ancient mistake of tearing down a convertible and flexible organization which can be moved, of dismantling its facilities, and disturbing the personnel, and then will find that we shall simply have to vote more money in appropriations for the Army and the Navy for the operation of training schools in plants, to replace the facilities which have been completing the training much more quickly under this one central agency.

For that reason, if for no other, I favor the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDIES

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I wish to speak, not on the pending bill, but on a subject which I

feel should be called to the attention of the Senate immediately. Last Saturday the Senate passed a bill dealing with the subsidy question. As I understand, under the amendments which were agreed to, some subsidies may be paid to producers and certain subsidies may be paid under commitments which have already been made by the administrative branch of the Government, but subsidies cannot be paid to processors or packers. I have given the subject some independent thought, and I earnestly feel that the position the Senate has taken on that measure is a mistaken one. I express that view with all proper deference to the views of every other Member of the Senate.

We have already set about to peg or fix the wages of the working men of the country. It seems to me quite unfair and quite illogical not to fix, or permit the fixing of, the prices of the necessities of life, such as foodstuffs. I desire to say that under ordinary circumstances, in usual times, I am fundamentally opposed to price fixing; but these are unusual times, and I recognize the necessity in time of war for fixing the prices of the articles generally used by our people. I am fundamentally opposed to the payment of subsidies in any form, but if a subsidy is necessary in order to carry out logically and with fairness a plan of price-fixing in this country, then we must give way so far as our views upon subsidy are concerned.

If food prices are to be fixed or maintained, if the prices of commodities which the people buy from the stores, and on which they must live, are to be fixed, someone somewhere along the line between production and consumption must take a loss.

The administrative officers in whose hands we have placed the duty of administering prices brought forth a plan with respect to meat. There was to be a roll-back or a fixing of prices as of a certain date. Necessarily, if there was to be a roll-back of prices which the consumer must pay, there would have to be a roll-back of prices all along the line. However, it was felt—and I think with fairness—that we ought not to roll back the price upon the farmer or the stock raiser, because they should have the incentive to produce meats and other foods. Necessarily it followed that somewhere in the middle of the line someone would be paying more for the product than the price which he would receive for it. Somewhere the slack had to be taken up; and with respect to meat it was planned to subsidize the packer to the extent of \$2 a hundredweight on beef carcasses so that he would not operate at a loss and consequently have to close his business, for if he closed there would be no meat in the stores for the people.

That was a novel plan. It struck me as such, and no doubt it so impressed others. But after thinking it over, it seems rather logical. Therefore, in order to permit the stock raiser and the farmer to receive the best price obtainable, it was proposed to subsidize the packer, so that he would not lose money and close his packing house, thereby shutting off the market for the sale of livestock and closing the retail markets

to the consuming public of America. The Senate refused to adopt this plan. I believe that it should have been given a trial.

I realize that the view which I am expressing today is somewhat different from that which I have expressed in previous discussions; but I hope that I shall always express a change of view when I feel that I am mistaken. With great deference to every other Member of this body, I feel that we have made a mistake. I feel that if in time of war we are to try to stabilize incomes or wages, in all fairness we must stabilize the prices of products which the people who receive the wages must buy.

It is my earnest hope that this body will reconsider this legislation. It is a departure for me to advocate a subsidy for anything. It is a departure for me to advocate fixing prices in this great country of free enterprise, but at the same time I must recognize the great exigency which exists in time of war and that price fixing on the generally used commodities—foodstuffs in particular—must be tried. If to do that requires the accompaniment of a subsidy, then, I repeat, Mr. President, that we must accept the principle of subsidies. It is my earnest hope that this body will reconsider its action on this question before we leave here.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask the Senator from West Virginia if I have a proper understanding of the legislation. As I understand, we recognized the principle of subsidies.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the principle of subsidies was recognized with respect to the payment of subsidies to producers, but no provision was made for the middleman—the packer, in the case of meat. If we recognize the principle of a subsidy to the producer, but not to the packer or processor, how are we to keep prices stable unless somewhere along the line the slack is taken up? Let me say to the able Senator from Nebraska that it seems to me that what we have done is bound to react unfavorably to the farmer or producer of foodstuffs.

Mr. BUTLER. If I may interrupt the Senator, the talk about a roll-back has already injured the producer of livestock to the extent of the amount of the proposed roll-back. The producer is himself paying a subsidy.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is just what the roll-back will do unless we have a subsidy. That is the point I am trying to make. Unless we can take up the slack and pay the difference in the middle of the process between production and consumption, the farmer, the food producer, is bound to lose. He ought not to lose, because he ought to continue to have every incentive to produce sufficient, even abundant, foodstuffs for our country.

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly. The reason for adopting the subsidy is to use it where necessary to obtain the required amount of production.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Then we should not make a price to the consumer which will not allow the processor his margin for processing the farm crops.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If we do that, we permit prices to rise, beginning at the bottom. That must not be done, because if that were done we should have no price fixing whatever. In order to keep the price down for the general buying public, it ought to be fixed, pegged, rolled back, or whatever may be proper, and then the slack, if I may use that word, or the difference, should be taken up in the middle—in the case of meat, with the packer. Under this legislation we cannot pay the packer a subsidy. Therefore we stop any plan to keep prices in the retail stores from rising.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been listening to the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Nebraska. I am particularly interested in the advocacy by the Senator from West Virginia of the payment of subsidies to processors. The agencies of the executive department have based their authority to pay subsidies to processors on section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act. I have before me a copy of the act. I should like to have the Senator from West Virginia examine it and point out wherein authority is given for the payment of subsidies to processors.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In reply to the Senator, I shall not attempt to point out wherein authority is given to pay subsidies to processors. What I am trying to persuade the Senate to do is to adopt legislation to permit it, so that such a plan can be carried out.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from West Virginia has quite an undertaking on his hands. There certainly is no authority in that law for paying subsidies to processors.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish it were possible, although I recognize that it is probably impossible, for Senators to dissociate themselves from any prejudices which they have had against the past program, administration, or activities of the National Youth Administration, and to think of it now exclusively from the standpoint of the work which it is doing directly related to the training of men and women for effective and efficient employment in our war plants.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to interrupt the trend of the Senator's argument, but will he yield for a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is Aubrey Williams still the head of the National Youth Administration?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. He is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is he the same Communist who was head of the N. Y. A. when it started?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator has asked a question which, he well knows, is not capable of a "yes" or "no" answer. It is like the famous question, "Have you stopped beating your wife?" Answer "yes" or "no."

In the first place, I have known Mr. Aubrey Williams for a great many years. Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So have I.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. He was previously very active in welfare work in my State. If Mr. Williams is a Communist, I do not understand the meaning of the word. I have never heard any expression from Mr. Williams, either public or private, which would justify the statement implied in the question of the Senator from Missouri. After Mr. Williams has been investigated by the F. B. I. in connection with the amendment which is always attached to appropriation bills—the so-called Overton amendment—if Mr. Williams is still being retained in office, and if the Senator's implications are correct, the Senator is casting a reflection not only upon the Administrator of the Federal Security Administration, but also upon the investigative ability of the F. B. I. and the Civil Service Commission.

The Senator's question, I assume, proves that my expression of hope that Senators would consider this program without personal prejudice is not capable of being realized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I dislike to ask the Senator to yield, but the implications of the question of the Senator from Missouri are such that I feel compelled to say a brief word about Mr. Williams.

I have known Mr. Williams for a number of years. I have not always agreed with him; in fact, I have frequently disagreed with him. I disagreed with him quite vigorously on the occasion when he was supposed to have made the statement to certain relief workers in Washington that they knew who their friends were, and statements of that nature. However, I do not like the implication that he is a Communist, because in my contacts and associations with him I have become definitely convinced that Aubrey Williams is an honest, loyal, intelligent, and patriotic American citizen.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, of course I should like to make the same reservations the Senator from New Mexico has made. I have not always agreed with Mr. Williams. On many occasions I have disagreed with him. As to some aspects of the administration of the N. Y. A. program I have disagreed with his policies. But if I ever knew a man who fundamentally believed in the concepts of American government as exemplified in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of the

United States and who sincerely desired to aid his fellow men and to assure them a better opportunity in this life, it is Mr. Aubrey Williams. He exemplifies that philosophy.

Mr. President, as has been stated by Senators who have preceded me in the debate, since the N. Y. A. has been taken over by the Federal Security Administration, since the inauguration of the defense program, and more particularly, since our entrance into the war, the N. Y. A. has been greatly streamlined. It has had most of its activities directed to the training of persons who were not trained in skills, thereby enabling them to respond to the inordinate and extraordinary demands of industry for new employees. That has been done, first, because of the enormous expansion in industrial activity; and, second, because of losses which industry has sustained to the armed forces, through the rapid expansion of the Navy, the Army, and the other military services. It is my deliberate view that we need more, not less, training of industrial manpower if the war production effort is to maintain schedule. It is necessary only to recall the recent statement of Under Secretary of War Patterson that, despite the great achievements of management and labor in expanding to meet the prodigious demands of lend-lease and of our own armed forces, we are behind schedule. I believe I am correct in stating that Lieutenant General Somervell, who is in charge of the Services of Supply, has stated that our armed forces will not be fully equipped until some time in 1944.

The War Manpower Commission has estimated that an additional four and a half million persons will have to be employed in essential industries during the coming year. Every Senator who is at all familiar with industrial employment knows that we are scraping the bottom of the manpower barrel. The War Manpower Commission estimates that if allowances are made for the few who still can be obtained from the ranks of the employed, or as the result of a transfer of workers from less essential industries, at least 2,500,000 of the added working force essential to maintain the war production necessary properly to arm and equip our forces will be without any previous shop experience or training.

Mr. President, it is true that we have other means of training those who have not previously been trained. There is one program which provides for their training in industry. We also have the Federal-State aid system for vocational education.

I do not like to be constantly referring to my own State, Mr. President, but I believe that any disinterested person will acknowledge that Wisconsin probably has one of the finest, most efficient, and most widely distributed Federal-State vocational school systems in the United States. In the city of Milwaukee, alone, is located what I have been told is the largest vocational school in the world. It occupies a full city block. That institution, as well as all similar institutions in the State which were built up through the Federal-State vocational aid system, will, of course, continue to contribute trained employees. But after

a careful study of the situation I do not believe that even in my State they will be able to furnish the quickly trained manpower essential to meet the requirements of Wisconsin industrialists so as to enable them to meet their commitments and schedules in war production. I have personally been informed by men of the most conservative type in my State that they believe the striking down of this program would be a great mistake. If men in such responsible positions of industrial management take that position in the shadow—if I may say so—of the great vocational education institution located in the city of Milwaukee as well as in view of the other vocational schools which are located throughout the State of Wisconsin, I ask in all fairness what can be the situation in States which have not built up an adequate Federal-State vocational education system? How is the training to be accomplished of the individuals whose services it is necessary to use if the fighting men in uniform on the battlefields of the world are to receive adequate delivery of equipment with which they may be properly armed in order to have a chance to succeed and to protect themselves in the holocaust of war?

I think it is fair to state that any person who has made a study of the recent activities of the National Youth Administration must admit that it is no longer a relief agency and that it has been to all intents and purposes streamlined and converted to the war effort.

The training which is being given is a result of the closest cooperation and consultation with industry and with the experts of the War Manpower Commission. I may say that, as is essential in order quickly to train persons needed for particular shortages of skills, training is given under the present program only in those skills which are deemed essential to war production. In the fiscal year 1942 there were trained under this program 386,000 persons who are known to have taken work in some skilled phase of war production, and another 300,000 have gone into related phases of war industry. That is a total of 686,000 persons. I say, Mr. President, that in my opinion—and I am not dealing in theory; I am not attempting to salvage any moribund shreds of a New Deal agency—we cannot afford, unless we wish to cripple the already seriously hampered effort of industry to maintain its employment levels, to strike down an agency which has such a record without providing any competent and effective substitute for it. It is perfectly preposterous to endeavor to fall back on the Federal-State aid system, for the reasons I have already pointed out, namely, that even in my own State, which is highly developed industrially, while the industrialists consider that that system is making a valuable contribution, yet it is inadequate and needs to be supplemented by the work of the National Youth Administration. No substitute can be found for it in States which because of the lack of financial ability have been unable to build up a highly developed Federal-State aid vocational education system.

N. Y. A. is now turning out 700 potential war workers every day. Even the majority report of the Byrd committee admits that 500 of them go into war industry. This figure is based upon Mr. Williams' estimate of those who are known actually to have gone into war industry. The estimate of 700 daily, which I have just given, includes others who have been trained in essential skills which are in demand by war industry but for whom the N. Y. A. does not have any specific record as to where they took employment.

I do not wish to overemphasize the fact, but there has been a considerable or at least an appreciable contribution to the war effort as a result of this training program in the manufacture of simple items which have been produced as a result of the training provided by the N. Y. A. They have already been mentioned here, and I shall refer to them only briefly. They produced 311,000 specific items in 1 year's time for the Portsmouth Navy Yard; they have been making large quantities of welded ship ladders for the Maritime Commission ships, and other articles of similar nature. I do not wish to overemphasize it, but I say that even the products which have been fabricated as a result of the training have been put to useful service in the war effort, as mentioned by the Senators from Maine.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the criticism that the National Youth Administration in connection with its wartime training program has been extravagant is not borne out by the facts. Even the majority report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures admits, in so many words, that the National Youth Administration costs cannot be compared accurately with the Office of Education costs, and yet it seems to me that the committee attempts, in the face of this admission, to build itself a case against the N. Y. A. on just such a comparison.

It has been charged that the N. Y. A. has been keeping equipment in idleness. That is based upon a figure of 56,534 work stations, which include 17,000 work stations which N. Y. A. has declared to be surplus and has been put into warehouses for disposition by the Property Procurement Division of the Treasury Department. The implication from the comparison of the number of work stations with the number of trainees is that the work stations are most efficiently used when a greater number of trainees is assigned to them. Actually there is another factor, namely, the time which a trainee spends at a station. That factor must be considered if any fair comparison is to be made. In school it is not uncommon for a trainee to spend only a couple of hours a day at a machine. Under the N. Y. A. type of training through production the trainee spends 8 hours a day at his machine, and it must be obvious that his training in a particular, narrowly defined skill must come much more rapidly and obtain much quicker results than when as a trainee he is given a broad course in vocational education.

The N. Y. A. states that on an average each work station is used approximately 12 hours a day, and in machine shops and welding shops the enrollment figures show each work station is in use from 14 to 16 hours during a day, taking the average for the country.

There is no question that the N. Y. A. officials would like to see an expansion of their program, but, of course, they cannot expand it unless Congress provides more money for that purpose. They estimate that they have the equipment to handle another 50,000 trainees a month, although the present rate is about 30,000.

Mr. President, during the last 11 months this agency has been turning out trained persons at the rate of over a thousand a day. The grand total of those trained and prepared for war production by this agency during the last 11½ months is well in excess of 400,000.

What this means, when broken down into skills, is that each 7 weeks of the past year the National Youth Administration has turned out an average of 16,000 welders, 24,000 machine operators, 11,000 aircraft and sheet-metal workers, 6,500 radio and assembly workers, and numerous other thousands who have acquired some unit skill needed by the war effort.

In the face of this record, which is supported not only by the evidence given by the National Youth Administration itself, but which is supported by evidence given by employers, in view of this service and in view of the thousands who are being added monthly to war production, it is difficult for me to understand how anyone can advocate the abolition of the agency which is doing this work.

We are spending billions of dollars to speed up and insure final victory in the war, but although this is an agency making a contribution which industry approves and supports, for some reason there is a determination to abolish it.

I do not see how anyone can contend that opposition to the N. Y. A. is founded on economic reasons, for what possible economies can be realized from the destruction of training which turns out a trained welder or a trained machine operator for \$108, which is the cost under the operations of the National Youth Administration?

I know of no better authority upon which to rest the case as to whether or not we should continue this agency than those responsible for war production, that is, the war industries themselves.

Mr. President, it has been charged that there is duplication because of the Federal-State aid system and because of the training-in-industry system. I have made inquiry into this matter, and I find that the National Youth Administration has training facilities in 510 communities throughout the United States. Of the total training facilities, 40 are in communities where there are no other war production training facilities whatever. In about 320 communities, a harmonious and complete working arrangement exists between the schools and the National Youth Administration. These figures are based upon joint statements of the

schools and the National Youth Administration authorities.

This leaves the remainder in which whatever duplication there may be must be judged on the basis of the total need in those localities for manpower, and this can be determined only on the basis of whether or not the needs of industry are being supplied.

Mr. President, I desire to read very briefly from a letter which I have received from a director of one of the vocational educational schools in the State of Wisconsin. Bear in mind, he is the director of a school which has been developed and is being operated under the Federal-State aid vocational system. I have not obtained permission to use the name of the writer of the letter and therefore I shall not use it, but I shall be glad to show the letter to any Senator who may be interested. He says:

DEAR MR. LA FOLLETTE: I understand that the bill carrying an appropriation for the National Youth Administration will reach the floor of the House of Representatives Monday, June 14. Some papers are carrying attacks against the organization, some educators are condemning it, and some organizations are against it.

I want to take this opportunity to give you my reaction to the National Youth Administration program. I have been in contact with the organization since its inception. At first it served as a welfare agency and now it has a definite purpose in training war-production workers. Our vocational school is training workers for war plants and our graduates from Work Projects Administration, United States Employment Service referrals, and National Youth Administration are now working from coast to coast and from the Gulf to the Canadian border in war plants. We have trained and placed some 500 workers and, I may say, half are National Youth Administration referrals.

In other words, of 500 workers, 250 or more were produced by this N. Y. A. war-training program.

The training program we put on for National Youth does not duplicate our regular program.

Here is a letter from a man in the field who has been for many years at the head of this school. His letter to me is absolutely unsolicited, and I think his testimony should carry weight with Senators whose minds are at all open on this question.

In my mind, there is no conflict between National Youth and the vocational school. I do know that if National Youth is abolished our defense training program will shrink fully 50 percent and that means 50 percent less war-production workers.

Mr. President, I think we are justified, in the face of such statements, in trying to purge our minds of any prejudice against the National Youth Administration in the past or against its past program, and to consider it now in the light of its proven effectiveness as a means of helping to keep war industry functioning and of supplying the armed forces with the implements of war which are necessary to its successful conduct.

I read further:

Here is the situation in this locality. We have a great number of small communities in this area that have no vocational school or vocational courses in their high schools.

A boy coming from these schools is a helpless individual, as far as technical skill is concerned, in a war plant. The National Youth Administration has been able to bring these individuals into this city, pay them an amount sufficient for them to exist on while taking training and then place them after training in war production plants.

I'd like to give you the story of ———, the Winnebago Indian boy, from some county west of ———. He heard about the National Youth Administration and had his father write a letter asking for someone to see him, as he desired training. He was found living with his father in a hut, had one pair of socks and one poor pair of rubber high-top shoes, one pair of breeches, a sweater, and a cap. He was brought to ———.

Where this school is located—

and was completely outfitted by the local lodge of Elks, placed in National Youth Administration war training, and now he is working in an airplane factory on the west coast as a direct result of his National Youth Administration training.

Our local vocational school was in no position to help ———. We have one legislative scholarship of \$7.50 per month.

Evidently the high school in his vicinity did not attract him. What was done for him and what he is now doing can only be credited to the National Youth Administration and the cooperating vocational school.

The writer proceeds:

I feel vocational schools have a big job to do.

Secondary schools, too, have a big job to do and I, personally, feel that unless they make some needed curricular changes, they will be missing the boat just as the academics missed the boat when the high school came into being in the early nineties.

City schools have much to be concerned about the efficient teaching of the fundamental tool subjects.

I honestly feel that too many educators and some educational organizations are too much concerned about the National Youth Administration and its accomplishments when they really ought to be concerned about how good a job they are doing in their respective fields. Some outstanding work by them will go a long way in their making the headlines.

I think you would be amused at some of the arguments and typical propaganda that is being sent out to counteract the National Youth Administration. I'm not afraid of the National Youth Administration absorbing this school and thus losing my position, as some propagandists would like to have me believe.

A study of Wisconsin legislation since the inception of the dual educational system (separate State board of vocational education) will show that some of the same people and some of the same organizations and branches thereof, that are now trying to ax the National Youth Administration have repeatedly attempted to place Wisconsin vocational education under their control. They suffered defeat after defeat and, I believe for the first time this year, there is no bill in our legislature attacking the Wisconsin system.

I hope you will see fit to support an appropriation for National Youth Administration for 1943-44, I am,

Yours respectfully.

The letter is signed by the writer as director of his vocational school, the school of vocational and adult education, and also by the principal of the high school in that community.

Mr. President, let us be fair about the matter. There are two factors in the situation in which the N. Y. A. finds itself despite the splendid record which on the

whole it has made in training persons for the war program. The first is that it labors under the prejudice which attached to it because there were those who felt it was the entering wedge for general Federal education, and who opposed it on that ground. There is also some prejudice against the organization by those who are connected with the State-Federal vocational educational system. I think my record will show that no Member of the Congress since I have been here has exceeded me in my zeal to secure adequate support for that system. But, Mr. President, there is no more justification for those who are associated with that system to attempt to tear down the emergency wartime training activities of the N. Y. A. than there would be for them to attempt to destroy some other effective program which is in operation for the purposes of the war, and which is effectively achieving objectives which are essential to a sound functioning of our war program.

I realize, Mr. President, that in all probability every Senator has made up his mind how he intends to vote on this question, but believing as I do that the shortage of trained workers in industry will continue to grow until it becomes even a more serious menace to achieving the production goal essential to providing proper equipment for our armed forces, I could not allow this important matter to be decided without placing upon the record my sincere conviction as to the unfortunate consequences which I think will flow from a strangulation of this program, when at the same time we have no adequate substitute to place in its stead.

Mr. President, I am a member of an important conference committee—or at least I think it is important—and I shall have to be absent from the floor during much of the remaining discussion of this question. I do not want my absence to be taken as any indication of lack of interest in this subject, but I feel that I must attend the conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCRUGHAM in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Ravercomb
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the National Youth Administration was established in 1935. Up to July 1, 1943, it will have expended \$771,414,445. I doubt whether any single expenditure of the Federal Government has yielded smaller definite and concrete returns than has the \$771,000,000 which has been expended by the National Youth Administration. The same organization continues, although it is alleged that the program has been changed. It has a personnel of 11,806.

Strange as it may seem, Mr. President, the first suggestion for the abolition or transfer of the National Youth Administration came from a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau. On November 14, 1941, Mr. Morgenthau, appearing before the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, said:

It would seem that the regular activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration must conflict with the more important defense program and should be eliminated or drastically reduced. It is suggested that all vocational training activities be consolidated in a new Bureau of Defense Training. Any overlapping functions or duplication of work should be eliminated, and one comprehensive program integrated with the defense program could be formulated and administered more economically than appears possible under present conditions.

Three important committees of Congress, after the most careful and serious consideration, have advocated the liquidation and abolition of the N. Y. A. Such a recommendation was made by the House Appropriations Committee after the most exhaustive hearings. The Senate Appropriations Committee also advocated the abolition of the N. Y. A.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MCCARRAN. If I may take a little of the Senator's time, let me say that the Congress of the United States appointed a special committee to investigate these matters. The Senate of the United States appointed the able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] the chairman of a group which would represent this body. Careful study of the whole subject was made, and now the chairman of that committee is addressing the Senate on a matter which involves millions of dollars. I respectfully say that order should be maintained so that the Senator's analysis of the whole subject may be heard and understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much.

As I said, both the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, after most careful investigation, have recommended to the Congress the abolition of the N. Y. A.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have not had the benefit of reading the report of the committee headed by the able junior Senator from Virginia—

Mr. BYRD. The report is on the Senator's desk, I may say, if he wishes to read it.

Mr. PEPPER. I have not had the benefit of reading the report recommending the abolition of the N. Y. A. Will the Senator give me succinctly the reasons why he makes the recommendation?

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will permit me to continue, I will do so, but I will have to do it in my own time and in my own way.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the committee find that the particular training was not done before, but should be done?

Mr. BYRD. I will deal with that if the Senator will listen to me.

Mr. President, the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, a year ago recommended the abolition of the N. Y. A. The committee made that recommendation and a minority report was filed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. The committee report was signed by Representative DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, the vice chairman of the committee; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], with a certain reservation; the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], Representative CULLEN, Representative TREADWAY, Representative WOODRUM, and Representative TABER.

This year the committee conducted another investigation; and by a report to the same effect, with only the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] dissenting, the committee again recommended that the N. Y. A. be abolished.

I first desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that seven different agencies are attempting to do the work of training within industry. We have, first, the Training Within Industry Service which advises on over-all on-the-job training problems, and is specifically assigned to promote production training through specific training programs for supervisors, instructors, and training directors. That is under the War Manpower Commission. I understand that when the Senator from Nevada addresses the Senate, he will show exactly what are the appropriations for each of the different activities which are included under the bill.

Second, there is the Apprentice and Training Service which advises on over-all training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through development of complete training programs.

Third, there is the vocational training for war production workers.

Fourth, there is the vocational training for rural war production workers.

Fifth, there is the engineering, science, and management war training, under the United States Office of Education.

Sixth, there is the National Youth Administration.

Seventh, there is the United States Employment Service, which is specifically assigned to deal with labor supply, and so forth.

In addition to the activities I have mentioned, the War Department has adopted the policy of permitting organizations which have war contracts to spend as much as 2 percent of the amount of the contracts for the training of workers within the different plants. I am told that such training is the most effective of all, because the training is given within the plant where the worker will later be assigned. The committee of which I am chairman was unable to obtain any definite figure as to that cost; but we were told by representatives of the War Department and the Navy Department that 2 percent which now is being deducted from many contracts, in addition to the appropriations for training which are being made by Congress, will amount to a very substantial sum.

It seems to me that the crux of the whole situation is found in the question: How many war workers in proportion to the total requirements are being trained by the N. Y. A.?

I was astonished to hear a Senator say just a few moments ago that if the N. Y. A. were abolished, one-half of all war-training activities would cease. I want to say that that statement has no justification whatever in fact, as I shall attempt to show to the Senate.

It is rather difficult to find out how many of the persons trained by the N. Y. A. finally get into war industries. Mr. Williams testified before the committee that he had no records to show what percentage of the N. Y. A. trainees finally went into war-production work.

This is the nearest thing I can find to a statement on the subject. I am quoting the language of Mr. Williams himself, from his testimony of May 25, before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Williams said:

Our records show that 350 of the 1,000 youth who leave our projects each day go into war production.

He claims that 1,000 are trained each day, and that 350 go into war production.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me where the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] obtained his figures? Earlier in the day he stated very definitely that 700 out of 1,000 went into the war effort.

Mr. BYRD. I could not say. I am reading to the Senator from Illinois exactly what Mr. Williams said, on page 297 of the House hearings on the N. Y. A. appropriation.

Mr. Williams continued:

For those concerning whom we have no record, and they are the greater number inasmuch as we are not permitted to expend any funds in placement work, we feel justified in assuming that at least one-fourth of the remainder go into war production, thus making the total 500 a day to go from projects into war production work.

I am willing to accept the statement that a thousand are trained each day,

and even that 700 of them go into war production work. That would be approximately 210,000 a year.

It was testified before the committees that 7,829,000 are needed and are being trained for war production work. So, even taking the larger figure which has been given, a figure which is 200 a day more than Mr. Williams stated in his testimony, the N. Y. A. is training only about 3 percent of those who are being trained in war industry. Assuming 300 days in the year, at the rate of 700 a day, that would be 210,000, which is about 3 percent of the total which it was testified were being trained by the various agencies for purposes of war production. That does not take into account the 2 percent deduction for training, in the war contracts which the Government has with industry.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a few facts which will be found in the report from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which is on the desks of Senators. I should like to have Senators follow the statement as to the number of students in the various States, and the number of work stations which are idle in the various States.

I am reading this information from page 9 of the report. First, there are only 12 States in which the work stations are being used 100 percent. Let us take first the State of Massachusetts. On November 18, 1942, Massachusetts had a total of 3,801 work stations. November 18, 1942, is the latest date for which figures are available from Mr. Williams. On that date there were 901 students. With 3,801 stations, there were 901 students. These are Mr. Williams' figures, which he presented both to the committee of which I am chairman, and to the Appropriations Committee.

In New Hampshire there were 202 work stations and 126 students on that day.

In the great industrial State of New York there were 3,852 stations and 3,093 students. In New York 35 percent of the work stations are now idle.

New Jersey had 1,168 work stations and 639 students. Twenty-eight percent of the equipment in that State is idle.

In North Carolina, with 1,380 work stations, there were 1,879 students, but 22 percent of the equipment was idle.

Coming down to the State of Nevada, represented by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Nevada did not have a single student on November 18, 1942, with 221 work stations.

In the State of Illinois there were 3,580 work stations, with 3,693 students, but with 36 percent of the equipment idle.

In the State of Tennessee 27 percent of the equipment was idle.

In the State of Texas 32 percent of the equipment was idle.

Rhode Island, a great industrial State, had 16 students. One would think that in the State of Rhode Island there would be many who would want to avail themselves of the facilities of the N. Y. A.;

but in that State on November 18, 1942—and I understand the situation is about the same today—there were only 16 students.

Mr. President, I shall not take up the time of the Senate to read all the figures.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is not the Aubrey Williams who is the head of the N. Y. A. the same Aubrey Williams who was formerly Acting Administrator of the W. P. A.?

Mr. BYRD. He is the same man.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is he not the same man who, when he was Acting Administrator of the W. P. A., was engaged in organizing W. P. A. "pensioners" at Government expense, telling them that they were entitled to control the Government, and that they ought to coerce Congress, if necessary, to continue that activity and continue them in employment, whether other employment was available or not?

Mr. BYRD. He is the same man.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator think that he is a proper man to be in charge of any technical training program in which the Government might wish to indulge at this time?

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator from Missouri. He is the same man.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He was not fit to administer W. P. A. before. As a matter of fact, he was appointed Administrator of the N. Y. A. so as to get him out of the line of fire, because of his maladministration of the W. P. A.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I notice the table to which the Senator has been referring in the report of the joint committee on pages 8, 9, and 10, and from which the Senator has quoted regarding the number of work stations and the number of students as of November 18, 1942. The grand total is 56,534 stations, and on that date there were only 53,722 students.

Mr. BYRD. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that correct? Were there more work stations than students?

Mr. BYRD. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of what does a work station consist? What is meant by a "work station"?

Mr. BYRD. It is possible for a number of students to use the same work station. A work station may be a piece of equipment at which a trainee learns to operate some activity for training as an industrial worker. It is not a separate building. It is a unit within the training center, but it is a fact that there are more work stations than students.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Ordinarily would not one work station accommodate more than one student?

Mr. BYRD. In a great many instances that is true. A great number of them are not in use. If the Senator will read the percentages in the next to the last

column he will see the percentage of equipment in each State which is not now in use.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I simply wanted to clear up what is meant by a work station, and to call attention to the total number of work stations as compared with the number of students.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to what happens when this equipment, which is very valuable for the war effort, is idle. I wish to show what becomes of the machinery and equipment which is not in use. It has been stored over the country. The committee has been unable to ascertain the cost of storage of it, except in one district, and that is Boston. There are 11 regions in the country. In Boston the only storage where figures of cost are available, the cost of personal service was \$65,394. The rental costs were \$32,112, making a total of \$97,506 for the storage of equipment, tools, and other things which should be in use in war industry, and which the N. Y. A. has been unable to use because it has not had enough applicants for training to use it.

This equipment is scattered all over the country. As I have said, there are 11 regions in the country. In this one region it is costing the United States Government \$97,000 a year merely to store the equipment and to pay for personal services for looking after it. That is what has happened to equipment which is not being used. The Senate will notice that in Massachusetts, for example, 79 percent of the equipment is not in use; in Delaware 23 percent; and in my own State of Virginia 78 percent.

I wish also to invite attention of the Senate to page 7 of the report of the committee, which shows the personnel of the N. Y. A. It has 11,806 employees to train 53,000 youths. In other words, it takes 1 paid employee to train 4½ trainees. If anything can be more extravagant than that, Mr. President, I do not know what it may be.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It takes more than the number which the Senator has indicated for the reason that, according to Mr. Williams, only a little more than one in every three goes into industry after the training period has been completed.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. Although Mr. Williams has revised his testimony and he now claims that 700 out of every 1,000 go into industry, in a statement which no doubt the Senator from Tennessee will refer to, Mr. Williams stated at one time that about 1 in 3 trainees went into industry. As a matter of fact, there is no record as to how many go into industry. It may not be over one-half, and it may not be over one-third. When the matter was under consideration before the committee the Senator from Tennessee interrogated Mr. Williams, who admitted that he had no records on the subject, but that he thought approximately 50 percent went into industry, but that the percentage might not be that high.

Mr. President, the traveling expenses of the National Youth Administration were \$1,470,000 a year.

The communication expenses of the N. Y. A. were \$207,667. Thousands of telegrams have come to Senators within the past week or so. It would be interesting to know to what extent, if any, the telegraph bill of the N. Y. A. has increased in the past 30 days. I have rarely seen such propaganda and pressure as has been put upon Members of Congress with respect to the continuation of the N. Y. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. A few days ago, before the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Williams very frankly admitted that he was using every method known to him to propagandize the matter with Senators in order to save the National Youth Administration.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to only one other feature. The Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Tennessee will also speak upon this subject. Mr. Williams now wants to pay 40 cents an hour to the trainees during their period of training. In other words, the plan is not only to train them so that they may receive good salaries in defense industries but to pay them 40 cents an hour out of the Federal Treasury while they are undergoing their training.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Following up what the Senator has said, I should like to say that in my State of Delaware girls are being paid \$40 a month to learn to be stenographers, and their transportation expenses back and forth to the centers are being paid.

Mr. BYRD. Out of the funds of the N. Y. A.

Mr. BUCK. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. That is what is occurring. I say that if any person desires to obtain a job in the Government at a high salary he should at least be willing to devote the necessary time at his own expense in training for the job, if the Government pays for the training. For the Government to pay a sizable salary while he is being trained is something which I think is unjustified.

Mr. President, we have been told in this debate that the N. Y. A. trainees have furnished a large number of articles of various kinds to navy yards. The number was stated to be 1,000,000, but they are not of any consequence. They are such things as bolts, nuts, and articles of that nature. No material contribution has been made by the N. Y. A. in furnishing to the industries of the country anything in the way of tools or equipment or materials.

A few days ago I was talking with the president of the Newport News, Va., shipyards, Mr. Homer Ferguson, who was possibly named after the distinguished Senator from Michigan, or possibly the Senator was named after Mr. Ferguson. At any rate, Mr. Ferguson is one of the finest men I have ever known.

He is doing one of the greatest jobs which any man of this country has done in the way of providing ships for the Government. A short while ago he was very highly complimented by the Truman committee.

Mr. Ferguson told me that the N. Y. A. trainees who came to him were of practically no value whatever. He had to retrain them, and he said that they would be much better off if they came to the navy yard and were trained there for the work which they had to do.

Mr. President, these are briefly the reasons why I am opposed to the continuation of the N. Y. A.

I wish to correct the impression—not by my own words but by the testimony of Mr. Williams himself—that he is training a very large percentage of the war workers of the country. He made the statement that the N. Y. A. was training approximately 500 students a day to go into war industries. Even taking 700 a day, which is the maximum number set by those who are advocating the continuance of the N. Y. A., he would be training only about 3 percent of the new war workers. According to the testimony, 8,000,000 must be trained each year to meet the needs of industry.

There is one other feature to which I wish to invite attention of the Senate. It has been adverted to here once or twice today. The N. Y. A. has solicited farm labor all over the country in order to pay them 40 cents an hour, or whatever the payment may be, which is being made at the training centers. I have a letter from the Washington County, Va., Farm Labor Board. It is not an organization which is set up under the Government. It is a part of the war farm service in the present emergency. The letter reads as follows:

ABINGDON, VA., May 28, 1943.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,

Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The Washington County (Va.) Farm Labor Board, at its regular meeting, Monday, May 24 asked that I write you as secretary of the board and express our appreciation to you for the stand and fight you are making against the National Youth Administration. Our board and we feel the public in general in this area are bitterly opposed to the National Youth Administration.

Each week from one to two large bus loads of young girls and boys leave Abingdon supposedly for National Youth Administration training centers. Not all of these youth are from this county. Abingdon seems to be the collecting center for three or four counties.

The National Youth Administration workers are scouring the rural as well as the urban communities recruiting these children. Many of these boys and girls are badly needed on the farms. Our board feels that the National Youth Administration is hampering the work we are trying to accomplish—recruiting workers for the farms.

Our board also feels that many of these youths, especially the girls, are too young to leave their homes or the care and protection of their parents. We feel the long time effect on these youths' lives will greatly outweigh any good that may be accomplished by National Youth Administration.

From very reliable reports the National Youth Administration workers have in the past made promises and used methods in recruiting youths that should not be tolerated.

Our board wants to urge you to do all within your power to have the National Youth Administration completely abolished as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,

WASHINGTON COUNTY FARM LABOR BOARD,
B. M. ARINGTON, Secretary.

Mr. President, the committee of which I am chairman has received thousands of letters urging the abolition of the N. Y. A. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them. However, I will say that many businessmen in the country are opposed to the N. Y. A. because they think it is of no value because they realize the need of the exercise of every possible governmental economy at the present time, and because they believe that other agencies could do the work much more efficiently.

The New Jersey Chamber of Commerce made a very exhaustive investigation of the situation with respect to the N. Y. A. in New Jersey. It would have no reason to oppose the N. Y. A. if the industrialists of New Jersey desired it, because, of course, the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce represents the businessmen of New Jersey.

I will read a few paragraphs from the press release:

The New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce recommended here today that the defense-training program now being carried on by the National Youth Administration be discontinued.

The recommendation was based upon a survey of the National Youth Administration training program in New Jersey, made by the State chamber's department of governmental research, of which Alvin A. Burger is director.

Originally 19 in number, the National Youth Administration training centers in New Jersey have been reduced to 5 because of decreases in enrollments. The 5 centers now operating are located in Jersey City, Newark, Trenton, Camden, and Phillipsburg. The National Youth Administration provides for the training of young men and women, between 16 and 24 years of age, in courses designed to equip them to take positions in war-production industries. The courses include machine shop, welding, sheet-metal work, and industrial sewing. Trainees now receive 25 cents an hour, or a maximum of \$40 for a 160-hour month.

I wish to state, Mr. President, that so far as I am able to ascertain—the Senator from Tennessee can better state it than I can—there is no authorization whatever for the N. Y. A. to increase its payments to trainees, from about 16 cents an hour, as it was a few months ago, to 40 cents an hour at the present time.

Conclusions reached by the survey as released by the State chamber are as follows:

1. The National Youth Administration defense training program in New Jersey is a weak, ineffective, and costly duplication of the training programs which are much more extensively and competently carried on by New Jersey's public vocational school system and by the training within industry service of the War Manpower Commission.

2. Most of the National Youth Administration training centers in New Jersey have been grossly mismanaged, with resulting wastage of manpower, equipment, materials, and public funds. The only existing National Youth Administration training center which is reported to be giving satisfactory service is that located at Camden. In this center, however, the training is actually supervised by the

Camden County vocational school system, although financed by National Youth Administration.

3. Most of the New Jersey National Youth Administration training centers have been manned largely by poorly trained, incompetent supervisory and teaching personnel.

4. In order to build up enrollments in some of its training centers, the National Youth Administration in New Jersey, has engaged in widespread proselyting activities among students in public high and vocational schools.

5. Some records kept by the National Youth Administration, such as those dealing with enrollment, trainee attendance, etc., appear in many instances to be incomplete and inaccurate.

6. The relationship between the National Youth Administration and the public-school systems in this State has deteriorated, thus creating a situation which is harmful to the general war production training program.

7. New Jersey's war industries generally have found the results of the National Youth Administration training program to be unsatisfactory, and they almost unanimously favor its discontinuance.

Mr. President, that is merely one of the many letters the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has received, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them all, because the one read represents the general scope and ideas which have been expressed in the other letters.

I desire to say in conclusion, Mr. President, that certainly I have no animosity and no prejudice in making this recommendation. It came originally, as I have said, from a suggestion made by a member of the President's own Cabinet, Secretary Morgenthau; it was considered carefully by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, composed, among others, of the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and the joint committee, by action, recommended the discontinuance and abolition of the N. Y. A. last year. This year, in view of the changed conditions that have occurred due to the war, we thought it was wise and proper by reason of the war situation to go into the matter again. We had long hearings. We had Mr. Williams before us, and, after consideration, the committee again renewed its past recommendation that the National Youth Administration be abolished and be liquidated as proposed by the House bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have been much interested in what the distinguished Senator from Virginia has had to say on the question of the National Youth Administration. I should like to put into the Record excerpts from the Executive order creating the National Youth Administration.

The National Youth Administration was created by Executive order of the President on June 26, 1935. I quote from the first paragraph of the Executive order:

By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Emergency Relief Ap-

propriation Act of 1935, approved April 8, 1935 (Public Res. No. 11, 74th Cong.), I hereby establish the National Youth Administration, to be within the Works Progress Administration, established under Executive Order No. 7034 of May 6, 1935.

It is my understanding that the President has already abolished or is in process of abolishing the W. P. A., and I can see no reason why that does not take with it the National Youth Administration which he, by Executive order, created as a part of the W. P. A.

I read further from the Executive order:

I hereby prescribe the following functions and duties of the National Youth Administration:

To initiate and administer a program of approved projects which shall provide relief, work relief, and employment for persons between the ages of 16 and 25 years who are no longer in regular attendance at a school requiring full time, and who are not regularly engaged in remunerative employment.

Mr. President, I suggest that today no such persons exist.

In the last paragraph of the Executive order dealing with the employment of officers and employees who may be necessary there is this proviso:

Provided, That, insofar as practicable, the persons employed under the authority of this Executive order shall be selected from those receiving relief.

I do not think anything more need to be said, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate for more than a very few moments. I appreciate the fact that there is prejudice on the part of some persons probably in and out of the Senate against the N. Y. A. because it was set up originally as a part of the relief program. It was established, as indicated by the order just read by the Senator from Wyoming, as a part of the relief program; it was intended to be a separate organization for young people who were unemployed and who were, for one reason or another, not attending school, some of whom perhaps were unable to provide the equipment necessary to enable them to attend school. Be that as it may, when the President undertook to liquidate the Work Projects Administration he did not include in his order of liquidation the National Youth Administration.

I realize that the National Youth Administration, in all probability, cannot be retained as a permanent part of our governmental set-up, and probably it should not be. I am one of those who think that the N. Y. A. has done a good job. It may have been needed more at the time of its establishment by the Executive order referred to by the Senator from Wyoming than it was needed later or immediately prior to the initiation of the new program of training for war purposes. Be that as it may, it seems to me, in spite of all the defects and shortcomings of the N. Y. A. through its history from 1935 to now, that, on the whole, it has done a constructive job. It has more to its credit than there is to its discredit; there is more on the credit side of the ledger than there is on the debit side of the ledger, in my judg-

ment, considering its activities from the beginning up until now.

I believe it is doing not only a constructive and desirable work now but that, insofar as it is doing it at all, it is doing an indispensable work. My information is that the Navy Department feels, and has so indicated its feeling, that if the N. Y. A. should be abolished the Navy would be deprived of a training program, which it has no other facilities to undertake, for putting men in shipyards and other institutions which are building ships and other equipment for the Navy. If that be true, and I have no reason to doubt it, it seems to me, that in the midst of this war we cannot weigh altogether the cost of any training program against the needs of the naval branch of our Government. As has been repeatedly said here, it is much better to have things we do not need than to need things we do not have, and if the Navy needs these trainees in order to place them when they have a certain amount of training, even though they might happen to need a little more training, into institutions which are manufacturing naval equipment, it seems to me we cannot quibble over the amount of money involved, if it is an indispensable activity that is needed by the Navy.

It has been suggested that the vocational facilities in the various States can do the same work, and can do it as well, and some contend they can do it better. It has also been contended that N. Y. A. is doing a work that is being duplicated by our public school systems, or which could be taken over and accomplished by our school system. No doubt actuated by that belief, many men and women connected with our schools—and I have talked with many of them in my own State, and in other States—have a feeling that if the N. Y. A. should be abolished, the school systems would obtain the identical funds, or an amount equal to the funds now being used for N. Y. A. training.

I do not so understand the situation. If the N. Y. A. should be liquidated entirely, or the appropriation should be withheld, it would not mean that our public schools would get the amount of money involved in the N. Y. A. appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that were the situation, does not the Senator believe the public schools could very much better handle the matter than the N. Y. A.?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I should not want to utter any sentence which would not to the fullest extent convey my appreciation of our public school system. I think there would be a hiatus between the abolition of the N. Y. A. and the complete integration of the same program in the public schools which might be a disadvantage. That is another thing which it seems to me at least should have some weight in making a comparison. The age at which students are admissible

into the public schools varies in the States, but none of them go beyond 24 years. I think some of them limit free tuition in the public schools to 18 years. Those who are being trained in the N. Y. A. are from 16 to 24 years. So that if we turned the training over to the public school systems the day after the N. Y. A. was abolished by the Congress, there could be a large number of young men and women between the maximum school age and the 24 years, which is now the maximum age for the training of trainees of the N. Y. A., who would have to be deprived of any opportunity for training because they could not go to the public schools for training, and they would not have the advantage of the facilities of the N. Y. A., and therefore they would be denied training. I do not know the proportion of those being trained month by month now between the ages of 18 and 24; I do not have the figures, but there certainly would be quite a large number.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is not quite accurate to say that the public schools could take over immediately the same personnel who are being trained, with the same age limits, and train them, because they could not do so without amendment of the school laws of every State, and it would of course be impossible to bring about amendments of the school laws in all the States so as to provide for training of men and women and boys and girls between the school-age limit and 24 years, the age to which they are being trained in the N. Y. A.

It was testified before the committee by Mr. McNutt and Mr. Williams that within the last year they have trained over 400,000 men and women, more than half of them women—by the way, as I recall, the testimony shows 51 percent of them are women. Those individuals are being trained to go into industry as welders, as radio workers, and to perform other technical functions, which must be performed if they are to go into any war plant with an approximate hope of being able to do efficient work.

As I have stated, it has been testified that within the last year they have trained over 400,000. They stated their program contemplated the training of over 600,000 in the next year. The Chairman of the Manpower Commission certainly is in a position to know, if anyone knows, the details of the needs of industry in regard to manpower in this country. If the Chairman of the Manpower Commission does not know, I do not know anyone who would know. He certainly should know; and if it be true that more than 400,000 young men and women have been trained in the last year to go into industry, and if it be true that, according to the testimony, more than 600,000 are needed in the next year for the same purpose, it seems to me we are taking a long chance in jeopardizing this training by even 1 week, by any threat to transfer an organization which is now working every day, in order to set up a new agency, or transfer the training to some other Federal or State agency which is engaged in part in the same kind of training.

These observations have reflected my views in regard to the N. Y. A. I think that in all likelihood the time will come, at the end of the war, perhaps sooner, when the N. Y. A. could be liquidated, and when we could, over a period of months, at least, work out an integration of the training now being given to these men and women so as to transfer it to some other agency, but I do not believe—and I am sincere in making the statement—that the agency should be abolished for another year at least, and because I entertain that belief I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 217) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 629) to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wild-life-refuge purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LeCOMPTE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LeCOMPTE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 25, 27, 45, 57, 58, 59, 68, and 70 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 32, and 72, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill

(H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 10 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 17, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the first line of the said amendment strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$260,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9 and 10.

PAT McCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KEER,
BUTLER B. HARE,
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN,
KARL STEFAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2397, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
June 28, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9 to the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum "\$33,940,358" proposed in said amendment insert "\$29,400,000"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 10 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

After the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment insert the following:

"The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained in this act shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 9 and 10.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no—

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Tennessee is the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I think what he has to say should be heard by the Members of the Senate, I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator insists, very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scrugham
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdoch	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I have previously said, I have been so busy trying to get appropriations through the committee in the last 2 or 3 days that I really must unbuckle my mind in order to have an intelligent understanding of the present situation in the Senate. I

do not know whether I can do so or not, but will do the best I can.

In 1935, when the N. Y. A. was established as a part of our relief system, it did very excellent work, I have no doubt. I am not complaining of it. But for several years the country has been in an entirely different situation than it was then. At that time hundreds of thousands of boys were roaming the streets with nothing to do. We did what we could do for them by way of sending them to school, by giving them training in vocational schools, by giving them various kinds of work, and I think it was very proper and right to do so. Through the W. P. A., the C. C. C., and the N. Y. A., we did what we could for those who could find no work. I have no regret for what we did, nor had I any objections to it; indeed, I not only supported the measures establishing those organizations but did all I could to help them along.

Two or three years ago the situation entirely changed. From being a nation which had millions of persons on relief we became a nation in which everyone who wanted to work could obtain work. Therefore, a little more than 2 years ago as I recall—and I call especial attention of the Senate to this, because of the plea that we carry the National Youth Administration for 1 more year—I introduced a bill to abolish the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A., as well as the W. P. A. The bill providing for the abolition of the N. Y. A. and the W. P. A. failed of passage. The C. C. C., however, was abolished and appropriations for W. P. A. were cut. I do not have the figures before me, but my recollection is that the appropriation for the W. P. A. was cut from nearly \$1,000,000 to less than one-half that amount; it was cut more than in two. A short time after that the President abolished the W. P. A. Only the N. Y. A. remained. I think it should have been abolished more than a year ago. I think it should have been abolished 2 years ago. We would have gotten along just as well without these three institutions as with them.

Mr. President, I have come in very close contact with these agencies because of the fact that the heads of the agencies have appeared before the Committee on Appropriations to obtain appropriations. They are not to be blamed for that. Once an administration or agency is established and takes hold, those in charge of it get into the habit of asking for appropriations. They come not only for appropriations in the amount they have previously received, but they come asking for more. But when there was no longer any necessity or reason for giving relief, I, as a practical everyday individual, having my country's best interest at heart, could not refrain from taking the stand that the time had passed when further provision should be made for these three institutions. I not only sought to keep them from obtaining appropriations, but I openly sought to abolish them by introducing bills to that effect.

Mr. President, as I have previously said, I believe these agencies did well

when they were needed. They are no longer needed, and have not been needed for more than 2 years. It is the most difficult thing in the world to get rid of a bureau once it has been created. I will give an illustration of that which appears in the record. Several years ago the agricultural appropriation bill contained an item for a particular Bureau which, I believe, received only about \$10,000 a year. I was looking up the Bureau for another reason, and I telephoned to the chief of the Bureau to know if I could obtain his last report. He said, "Senator, I have not had time to prepare a report." I said, "I would just as soon have one for the last year, or the year before that, or the year before that. Send me the last report you have." He said, "We have never yet had time to make a report." I said, "I call your attention to the fact that I have looked up the record, and I find that your Bureau was established in 1868."

At the time when that speech was made, for over 60 years that Bureau had been drawing \$8,000 or \$10,000 a year for certain individuals in it, but had never had time in the sixty-odd years to make a report. That is the trouble with a bureaucratic system.

So I say it is exceedingly difficult to abolish this agency, although I think nine-tenths of us feel that it ought to be abolished. My good friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], whom I am glad to see back here in health and vigor and strength, just said he thought that in another year it would be all right to cut it out. Some of our friends made that same argument about it a year ago: "Let it go on for another year, and then it will be all right to end it." I know I was told that I could not abolish both the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A. at the same time, and that I had better let one of them go for another year. Another year has passed, and here is Mr. Williams propagandizing the country. I expect all Members of the Senate have received letters from their home States urging them to stand by this organization.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. On the subject the Senator mentioned, I wonder whether he has any information about who pays for the telegrams and telephone calls sent by officials of the N. Y. A. in the field and from other men who work for the organization. I wonder who pays for those messages.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot give the Senator the information; but the inference from Mr. Williams' testimony before the Appropriations Committee is that the Government is paying for those telegrams, of course. We are paying for the very propaganda that is coming to us in the effort to try to have us retain this utterly useless organization.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky, let me inform the Senate that I received a telephone message from my

State the day after I voted in executive session as to how I voted. I do not know how the information was obtained, but the persons who sent the message knew.

Mr. McKELLAR. Propagandists are quite careful and quite crafty when it comes to getting the information back home where they think it will do good.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, yield again so that I may ask another question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I noticed in the report of the Byrd committee, of which Representative Doughton of North Carolina is also a member and vice chairman, that they listed 11,806 adult civilian employees who administer the program. I think the result is that there is one paid official for about four trainees.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is probably the most expensive bureau that ever was established in the Government at any time since our Government was founded.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then the Senator expresses the opinion that the number of civilian employees paid to administer it is a waste and an extravagance; does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only a waste and an extravagance, but an indefensible waste and extravagance. Let me tell the Senate that in our busy lives in government we sometimes overlook pregnant facts. The fact is that in every contract the Government makes with industrial organizations the payment of 2 percent of the contract is provided for. For what? For completing the training with which our good friend Mr. Williams plays? No; not at all. It is for the purpose of training. For instance, let us consider a plant in the State of Michigan which has, let us say, a \$5,000,000 contract. The Federal Government pays 2 percent of that \$5,000,000 contract. For what purpose? For training employees. But it is said that the additional training is all right. Perhaps so, but it is not necessary. I will tell the Senate why. Not an industry in the whole country will accept the training provided by Mr. Williams or the N. Y. A. All Senators know that to be so. Not a single one will accept the training the N. Y. A. gives. The industries proceed to train their employees just the same. They have gotten money from the Government to carry on such training. They train their own employees. They do not accept the training done by Mr. Williams, even if he does all the training he says he does.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. In view of the fact that the Senator has mentioned Michigan and the fact that industries in Michigan have large contracts—

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me say that we feel we can train the employees, not only in industry, but, as was stated by Mr. George H. Fern, director of the State board of control for vocational education, at Lansing, Mich., in a letter written on the 19th of January of this year:

I consider National Youth Administration training a duplication of effort, and training

which could be absorbed by vocational schools. There is no justification for paid work-project experiences at the present time since trainees can be quickly placed at work after intensive training at wages prevailing in war-production industries.

It seems to me that there is no place for the two training programs—one or the other should be discontinued.

Not only can our industries train the workers, but our public schools, our vocational schools, can train them. In Michigan we have adult education, so that we can take care of persons between the ages of 18 and 24. I think the letter of Mr. Fern as it appears in the report should be printed in the RECORD, and, with the Senator's permission, I should like to have it printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to having that done, and I thank the Senator for his interruption.

There being no objection, the letter referred to by Mr. FERGUSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If authorized by Congress, the vocational schools of Michigan could absorb trainees now in National Youth Administration programs without any difficulty and with very little, if any, additional administrative or supervisory expense.

I consider National Youth Administration training a duplication of effort and training which could be absorbed by vocational schools. There is no justification for paid work project experiences at the present time since trainees can be quickly placed at work after intensive training at wages prevailing in war-production industries.

It seems to me that there is no place for the two training programs—one or the other should be discontinued. Naturally I believe that all such training should be carried on through public schools that have had a long-time established program and, therefore, experiences necessary to meet the situation. Furthermore public schools are unbiased in their desire and effort to meet their obligation to serve the youth and adults of the country. The public schools have demonstrated their ability to carry on effective training during this war emergency at a cost which certainly cannot be questioned. The program as operated through the public schools, even though subsidized by Federal funds, is more in line with our democratic practices.

I am frank to admit that since two programs cannot be justified—it makes the cost to the taxpayer high—the programs should stand on their own merit and one or the other should be discontinued.

If the National Youth Administration program is transferred to the public schools, these schools should be given the opportunity to transfer needed equipment for training purposes from the National Youth Administration shops. In many cases the National Youth Administration has had priorities on securing equipment, and thus has always had first choice. Any surplus of equipment could certainly be absorbed by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps.

National Youth Administration students are only supposed to be enrolled in National Youth Administration projects, which are reimbursed in part through a cooperative plan with the State board for a period not exceeding 3 months. We have cases where trainees will be enrolled in the National Youth Administration, in one resident project; for example, Traverse City, and at the end of 3 months the same trainees will be transferred to Cassidy Lake for an additional period of time. The individuals will also be enrolled twice on National Youth Administration enrollment figures. We have been advised that some trainees in National Youth

Administration projects have been enrolled for periods as long as 14 months. (George H. Fern, director, State board of control for vocational education, Lansing, Mich., January 19, 1943.)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me call attention to the point just discussed by the Senator from Michigan. I do not know whether the Government will enter into \$100,000,000 worth of contracts this year. It may be entirely within the realm of possibility and reason that we shall enter into \$100,000,000 worth of contracts this year for war materials and implements of war. Assuming that the Government should do so, it would be paying out \$2,000,000,000 for training young men in the war industries of the country. After expending \$2,000,000,000 for training in the very best places in the world where men could be trained, in the factories where they will go to work, certainly the idea of our appropriating \$47,000,000 for Mr. Williams and his outfit, merely to keep it alive, on the excuse that it is for war training, is without any semblance of reason or excuse.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my friend mind another interruption?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have been trying to justify, if I could, a vote for the training of the poor little people about whom I have heard so much said here. But if the N. Y. A. program is a waste and is utterly futile, here is something I should like to have the Senator explain. I have been reading the reports and hearings. According to the latest reports on work stations and employees, the National Youth Administration had 53,722 trainees, but they have 56,534 work stations. They have more work stations than trainees. I wish the Senator would explain that, if he can.

Mr. McKELLAR. Ordinarily a work station is a place of work for one person.

By the way, I digress here long enough to say that when, several years ago, I introduced a bill to provide for abolishing the N. Y. A., it failed of passage. Such a bill failed last year and has failed of passage this year. I submitted the matter to the Byrd committee, to have it take the proof. The Byrd committee is made up of such men as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the chairman of the committee; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYS], Representative DOUGHTON, Representative CULLEN, Representative ALLEN T. TREADWAY, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Representative CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, and Representative JOHN TABER. That committee took the proof. They have made a report; and so far as I know, the report was unanimous. I will ask the Senator from Virginia if the report of the committee recommending the abolition of the N. Y. A. was unanimous, or was there objection?

Mr. BYRD. It was unanimous, except for the minority views signed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. McKELLAR. With the exception of the Senator from Wisconsin, the report was unanimous.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I think I should say that on the day when the Senator from Wisconsin procured permission to file his minority views, I made the statement for the RECORD that I did not think we should abolish the N. Y. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then there were 12 members of the committee in favor of it and two against it—two of our best Senators. I wish to be perfectly courteous, because I am a great admirer of both Senators, but I differ with them.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. In reply to the statement by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] there are now 39,281 work stations and 59,055 trainees. The 16,814 work stations, representing the difference between 39,281 and 59,055, which totals I placed in the RECORD awhile ago, are being used in this manner:

Loaned to non-Federal agencies (schools) and subject to recall, 4,675.

Declared as surplus to the Treasury Procurement officer for disposition, 5,184.

Equipment listed on Declaration of Surplus Documents in process of transfer to Treasury Procurement, 1,468.

Equipment transferred to other agencies, 3,260.

Equipment in process of transfer to new work locations, 2,227.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. What has happened in this case is that 17,000 work stations have been stored.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was just about to read to the Senate what the record shows, and what Mr. Williams, the chief propagandist in this whole matter, said. He is a delightful gentleman, but nevertheless a propagandist for the bureau of which he is the head. This is what Mr. Williams said 2 or 3 days ago when he was examined by the House Committee as to these very stations:

Part of what they take care of is the 17,000 work stations which we have not been able to get rid of, and a part of which is stored in warehouses, where we are paying the rent on them.

In other words, we are proposing to abolish an institution which, in effect, has already abolished itself. Apparently most of the work stations are not only not used for training boys, but they are stored away, and doing no one any good. We are paying rent on them.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What is it that is stored away?

Mr. McKELLAR. The work outfits on which the boys are trained.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The tools?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Listen to this:

That has cost us a good deal of money.

It will cost us a good deal of money so long as we continue this activity.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. In a minute. I think this will answer the Senator's question:

We did everything we could to get rid of them, and we were successful until there was issued an order providing that all disposal of surplus property had to be handled by a central agency, which took the matter out of our hands.

That is the kind of organization which it is proposed to continue for another year. Our distinguished majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] thinks it should be continued for another year. It would cost \$47,000,000 to continue it for another year, most of it going in high salaries to favored employees, without a single dollar of good being done, in my judgment, in the training of the youth of the country.

As I remember, Mr. Williams claimed that a total of 900,000 had been trained last year.

Senator McKELLAR. Nine hundred thousand last year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. How many of those went into industry?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have records on 320,000.

That is a little over a third.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Were 1,000,000 trained?

Mr. McKELLAR. Nine hundred thousand. The ratio is not quite 3 to 1. Probably half of them are girls. I am in favor of training girls; I am in favor of training men; but what good does it do when no industry will take any of those who are thus trained? This organization is like a fifth wheel to a wagon. We are making a present of \$47,000,000 for an absolutely useless project.

The question has been asked, "Why are the trainees put in schools?" It is said that it helps the schools. Confidentially—I am talking as one Senator to another; it will be a long time before my reelection campaign comes up, and I am not bothering about it now—but confidentially, I understand that the schools are all opposed to the program. No wonder. I am willing to have the Government contribute money to the schooling of boys and girls; but it would be so much better to establish a system whereby boys could be trained. It costs probably a thousand dollars apiece to train these boys. There is no telling how much it costs. It costs an enormous sum. It would be cheaper for the Government to contribute one-half the cost of educating the boys, rather than to continue a half-baked, utterly useless, and utterly indefensible bureau of this kind.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. How many have been trained in a year? How many students have attended these stations, and how many stations are there? As I understand, the number of students is a little less than one million. How many stations are there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will give the Senator the figures. He will find them in the report of the Byrd committee, on pages 9 and 10. The total number of work stations last year was 56,534. The number not in use last year was 17,000. Think of it! The Government owns the tools comprising 56,534 work stations. Seventeen thousand work stations are in storage. How can we defend a vote in favor of carrying on a bureau of this kind under the circumstances?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator has stated that after the youths are trained by the N. Y. A. industry will not accept them.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Upon what is that statement based?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is based upon the testimony of witnesses. Mr. Williams himself testified that industry would not take them until it had trained them after they had been trained by the N. Y. A. Industry would not accept the N. Y. A. training.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that be true, then the Government, through the N. Y. A. is paying for the training once; and when the trainees go into industry, through the 2 percent deduction in war contracts, they are trained again with Government money.

Mr. McKELLAR. We train them twice with Government money; and one man is required to train one boy or girl. By the way, it is admitted that not half of them ever go into industry.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I understand there are 11 regions in the country. As the Senator has explained, in those regions about 17,655 stations have been placed in storage. Is it true that in the Boston area alone it cost the Government \$97,506 merely to store the stations?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read from a letter which was received from Boston. It may not answer the question of the Senator from Kentucky. I shall have to read it and see. I read as follows:

If the history of the National Youth Administration were ever written, I would say that it would be one of the most vicious attacks on the rights of the taxpayers of this Republic that we have ever known. This school has at the present time—

That is the school in Massachusetts—the most modern up-to-date machine-shop equipment together with the most modern tools. There are instructors there drawing \$12 and \$15 a day—

We have already paid perhaps a billion and a half or two billion dollars for the purpose of training these boys to go into industry. I continue reading—

who have had during the past month as few as two pupils some days—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Two what?

Mr. McKELLAR. Two pupils, two students. I continue—

and some days those pupils would not come in.

Can you beat it, Senators? [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understand, the figures which the Senator is now reading merely have reference to the teachers absolutely on the job out in the field. However, when we add in Aubrey Williams, all the various assistants, and the gang here in Washington, as well as in the various regional headquarters, it is not unfair to say, is it, even if we were to assume that all the students would actually make the grade—which the Senator has said is not true—that each one would have to carry some big fat bureaucrat like Aubrey Williams on his shoulder every time he went to class in the morning? Is that not true? [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Senators, I do not wish to say anything mean about anyone. [Laughter.] I merely wish to give the facts. The letter from which I have been reading is from James N. Muir, superintendent of the Quincy Public Schools, Quincy, Mass., and is dated March 15, 1943. It bears on what the Senator from Missouri has just said. It goes into detail. Listen to this, as showing the attendance for the week of February 8, under the N. Y. A.

	Pupils
Monday, Feb. 8.....	5
Tuesday, Feb. 9.....	6
Wednesday, Feb. 10.....	6
Thursday, Feb. 11.....	6
Friday, Feb. 12.....	8

They do not work on Saturday or Sunday.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That does not include the overhead in Washington and in the various regional headquarters of the big fat bureaucrats to whom I referred.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does it show how many instructors receiving from \$12 to \$15 a day were present with the six students who are enumerated in the letter?

Mr. McKELLAR. The letter states as follows:

There are instructors there drawing \$12 and \$15 a day.

Let me read further:

This is the best attendance they have had in some time.

Mr. SMITH. This is what?

Mr. McKELLAR. It says:

This is the best attendance they have had in some time. There are 49 stations.

We have in the city of Quincy a trade school with an enrollment of 254 pupils, which is adjacent to the Quincy High School with an enrollment of 1,600 pupils. In the Quincy Trade School we have regularly from 62 to 72 pupils taking machine-shop practice. We are obliged to go out and get third- and fourth-rate lathes which should be sold for junk, while this up-to-date machinery is standing idle.

Senators, can you beat it? [Laughter.]

I do not see how it is possible for us ever to defend a vote to spend \$47,000,000

to carry on such an institution as this. However, I have not finished. I continue to read.

If we had this machinery we could put it to work for defense purposes. It could be used to advantage. The large Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation is clamoring for machinists.

The letter is signed by James N. Muir.

Senators, I have a dozen letters to which I could call attention. They come from various States. Take the State of Rhode Island, for example. I cannot leave out Rhode Island. I see in the Chamber my good friend, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. In a moment I shall yield the floor to him. Rhode Island is one of the important manufacturing States of the Union, as I understand. I have seen more manufacturing plants there per square mile than anywhere else in the country. Do Senators know how many stations are located in the State of Rhode Island? There are 16. They have trained 16 individuals. Aubrey Williams and the N. Y. A. have trained 16 individuals in the great manufacturing State of Rhode Island. Can you beat it? It does not make decent common sense.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. I do not know to whom the distinguished Senator from Tennessee referred when he said it does not make decent common sense.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was referring to Mr. Williams and the N. Y. A.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I know that the N. Y. A. in Rhode Island has not always made a good record, and that a good many stations there should be abandoned. It may be that at one time, on the day this census was taken, they had only 16 students of this type. However, I received a complaint from the assistant superintendent of the public schools of Providence of a nature similar to the one which the Senator from Tennessee just read.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know that it checks.

Mr. GREEN. I took the trouble to check it. I think it would be well if the other communications had been checked in the same way. I should like to read—it seems to me only fair that I should do so—the reply which I received as the result of this complaint.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be perfectly willing to have the Senator do so.

Mr. GREEN. Especially as it brought the matter up to date, the letter having been received by me day before yesterday. It reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I have read the letter of Mr. Richard D. Allen, assistant superintendent of the Department of Public Schools, of Providence, R. I., which you so kindly forwarded to me. In his letter Mr. Allen, speaking of the student work program, makes the extremely serious charge that upon "orders from Washington" the National Youth Administration "deliberately went out of its way to find people to whom they could give Government subsidies whether they needed them or not."

Because of the malfeasance charged, I had the case investigated with particular care. In

view of the facts, which are here set forth, it is difficult for me to understand how any responsible educator claiming to have knowledge of the National Youth Administration would permit himself to make such sweeping accusations.

On June 17, 1942, when it was known that Congress had appropriated \$5,000,000 to aid needy college and graduate students in fiscal year 1943, Mr. Aubrey Williams, Administrator of the National Youth Administration, sent an identical letter to each of the presidents of the 1,700 colleges participating in the student work program. A copy of one of these letters follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1942.
Dr. HENRY MERRITT WRISTON,
President, Brown University,
Providence, R. I.

DEAR DR. WRISTON: The Congress, as you are probably aware, appropriated \$5,000,000 to assist needy college and graduate students, through work stipends, to continue their education during the fiscal year of 1942 and 1943. This is approximately one-half of the amount of funds expended for this purpose during the past year.

The limitation of these funds to only those students who, without National Youth Administration assistance, absolutely cannot attend college otherwise, is accentuated.

We have, therefore, the feeling that there is a special need this year for the fullest understanding and cooperation on the part of the college authorities if we are to make an allocation of these funds in complete keeping with the purposes for which they are appropriated.

We are asking that you supply us, on the attached affidavit, the absolute minimum figure, indicating those students who, without these funds, cannot enter or continue in college.

I shall appreciate your consideration of this whole matter, and the return of the enclosed affidavit in duplicate at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

AUBREY WILLIAMS,
Administrator.

(A copy of the affidavit mentioned in the letter, which each college president was required to execute, is attached hereto.)

When you consider the foregoing letter and the fact that 1,700 college presidents have executed these affidavits and that only upon the basis of these affidavits are any payments made, it becomes clear that your correspondent impugns the integrity of each and every one of them, including 6 college presidents in his own State.

That is, Rhode Island. I continue reading:

I am amazed, as I have no doubt you, too, will be, that any educator should place himself in the unenviable position that Mr. Allen has placed himself in with respect to this distinguished body of men by his irresponsible and baseless charge.

Against the National Youth Administration war production training program in Rhode Island, Mr. Allen makes the general charge that it was a "phony from the very beginning." As he claims to have been chairman of the Rhode Island advisory committee of the National Youth Administration at one time, it is a bit odd that he should now condemn it as a "phony from the beginning."

National Youth Administration, now, so Mr. Allen further alleges, "enrolls people unqualified for the kind of work for which they were being trained"; the latter charge despite the fact that hundreds of National Youth Administration trained Rhode Island youth have entered and are now entering such establishments as the Newport Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I.; Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co., Providence, R. I.; Franklin Process

Co., Pawtucket & Rhelms Shipyard, Providence, R. I., and despite the fact that other companies are requesting National Youth Administration trainees, as the following letter shows:

Here is a letter from the American Ball Bearing Co., of 115 Clifford Street, Providence, R. I. It requests the N. Y. A. to furnish them with additional trainees.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator be willing to let the remainder of the letter go into the RECORD?

Mr. GREEN. It is very short, only a paragraph, and I should like to read it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. McNutt's letter continues:

In his letter no attempt is made by Mr. Allen to advance an iota of evidence to support any of his allegations. Such generalizations hardly deserve comment, but for your information let me say that in the early months of fiscal year 1943 there were 200 youths in training per month in Rhode Island, with approximately 125 youths a month leaving to enter local war production industries. As trainee supply diminished, the centers not needed were closed and steps were taken to transfer the equipment. Woonsocket, one of the centers, closed in October 1942, was not dismantled because the equipment was driven by overhead-line shafts, which it was better to leave in place until final disposition was determined.

And there are cases to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred which I think are in the same situation. The letter continues:

Fortunately so, for early this year, at the request of the Woonsocket school authorities, this machine shop was reopened to train high-school seniors for war production work. It is the only public training facility in the city. At the present only the Providence and Woonsocket training centers are in operation.

Nowhere in the country has there been a better demonstration of the adaptability of National Youth Administration facilities to changing conditions than in Rhode Island, where training centers have been opened or closed just as rapidly as constantly changing industrial needs and changing trainee supply dictated. Had these training facilities been immobile, this could not have been accomplished and the war effort would have suffered.

At the time when the trainees seemed to me inadequate in number, I myself requested the closing of these stations and facilities at various places, and they were closed, but they were reopened when the demand for workers increased and the manufacturing establishments in Rhode Island called for additional help. It seems to me it is very proper that they should not be closed, but reopened, and that in the meantime the stations should be restored.

May I ask, in that connection, in order to be fair to Mr. Allen, that as a part of my remarks Mr. Allen's letter be printed?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is all right with me. I do not intend to send my speech out, and it does not make any difference if it rather interferes with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Providence, R. I., June 4, 1943.
The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I understand that the National Youth Administration is asking for an appropriation of approximately \$59,000,000, and feel it my duty to state to you my considered opinion in regard to the National Youth Administration program.

I was formerly chairman of the advisory committee for the National Youth Administration in Rhode Island and I have been closely associated with its work since the beginning. Its student-aid program was necessary and urgent as long as it kept within the bounds of actual need, but when the staff deliberately went out of its way on orders from Washington to find people to whom they could give Government subsidies, whether they needed them or not, it lost my support.

The National Youth Administration training program in Rhode Island has been a farce and a phony from the very beginning. It duplicated local facilities and personnel, enrolled people unqualified for the kind of work for which they were being trained, and was in many other ways a fifth wheel.

I respectfully urge that the National Youth Administration in this State be terminated, since it has outlived its usefulness and provides lavish expenditure for services which are inferior to and a duplication of facilities already available in the public schools and under the auspices of the United States Office of Education.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD D. ALLEN.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in answer to what the Senator has said, I wish to state that there are only 16 stations, only 16 people being trained in Rhode Island, which is the smallest number among all the States of the Union, except that represented by my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], in whose State there are none at all. He did not get any of Mr. Williams' benefits in his State.

Mr. GREEN. I am sorry the Senator paid no attention whatever to my remarks. I do not blame him, because his own are much more interesting, but I recall it was distinctly said that in Rhode Island, in the early months of the fiscal year 1943, there were 200 youth in training.

Mr. McKELLAR. The record does not so show.

Mr. GREEN. No, the record does not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry the record does not show it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator has no objection, I should like to get back to the cold storage proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the Senator does that, I wish to say that I have found another remarkable thing about the rent. There are 11 regions, and the cost of taking care of the material and tools in just 1 region is fixed as follows. Listen to this:

Personal services—

To look after the tools and material—

\$65,394.

Rental cost, \$32,112.

That makes a total of \$97,506.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the matter I had in mind. There are 11 regions in the United States, Mr. Valentine, testifying before the House committee, in answer to Mr. ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, said:

Of course, there are 11 regions in the country. However, I would like to say that the Boston region is an average example.

If it is, then we are paying 11 times \$97,506 for guards and for the storage of surplus materials.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be in excess of a million dollars.

Mr. CHANDLER. In excess of a million dollars in the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. Why not? It will help Mr. Williams; it will help all the gentlemen connected with him in the N. Y. A., and it will help their agents throughout the country. It will help them, because it will give them all salaries, for which they will not have to do much work.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was very much intrigued by the outbreak the Senator from Rhode Island just put into the RECORD, evidently from a fellow who was himself profiting to some extent by this program, that is, in the extension of this service. He says in the letter which the Senator from Rhode Island read into the RECORD that Rhode Island is a perfectly typical State, and one of the best examples of the National Youth Administration activity. The Senator from Tennessee has already proven that there are only 16 trainees there. If, according to the Senator from Rhode Island, Rhode Island is one of the best examples of this activity, and they are training only 16, we may assume the same ratio would prevail throughout the country, and when we see that my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri, proposes to spend forty-seven-million-and-some-odd thousand dollars—

Mr. TRUMAN. Forty-eight million dollars.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Forty-eight million dollars? It has increased since the last time I talked with my colleague by a million dollars. Of course, that is a very small amount in these parlous times, but it has jumped a million dollars since I last talked with my colleague.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It has jumped up a million dollars since I last talked to my colleague. It is now \$48,000,000 for a small handful of trainees on the basis of what the Senator from Rhode Island says is the best example of this program in the whole United States. In other words, if there are 16 pupils seeking the training in Rhode Island, there would probably be 100 in Tennessee, and 200 in Missouri, but even so it would simply be a small handful.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall retain the floor for only a half minute longer.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I wanted to give a piece of additional information which, judging from the remarks of the last Senator who spoke, I neglected to give. The correspondent who gave me that letter and that information as the result of having had a special examination made of the charges, was Mr. Paul V. McNutt.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That strengthens my view with respect to the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, Mr. McNutt is the head of the organization in which this bureau is located, and he wants to keep around him every one of the employees he can. That is what I have been complaining about. It is almost impossible to get rid of a Government agency, once it is established. It is like pulling an eye tooth to diminish any bureau's appropriation. To abolish it is as hard as it is for a camel to gain entrance through the eye of a needle. I know how hard it is, because I worked like smoke to have the C. C. C. abolished last year. I tried to have the N. Y. A. abolished, but was obliged to let that go over for a year. The plea now made is to have the N. Y. A. held over for another year, when it is the most useless thing in the world.

We have the so-called Byrd committee. I have not had time to give as much attention to the work of that committee as I should like to have given. There are on that committee as fine a lot of Members of both Houses as can be found. That committee voted 12 to 2 in favor of abolishing the N. Y. A. In the Appropriations Committee the other day, after one of the most active fights I can recall in that committee—and we have had a great many fights in it—by majority vote the committee turned down the N. Y. A. Two committees have turned it down. The whole country is opposed to continuation of the N. Y. A.

Mr. Williams, it is true, frankly stated that he was using every effort, propaganda and every other kind of effort, to keep this organization from being abolished. Now we have exactly what is being done. Yet some of us are willing to spend \$47,000,000 because a nice gentleman wants us to spend it for himself and for those under him. I am not willing to vote to do that. I shall vote against continuation of the N. Y. A. There has really been no need for the organization for 3 years. It has no longer any place in our Government. It never was authorized by law. It was established because it was necessary to put boys in school, or somewhere, to keep them out of mischief. The appropriation made for it was passed purely as a relief appropriation. The organization should not be allowed to continue a minute after the 30th of June, which will be next Wednesday.

Mr. President, I have concluded. I yield the floor, or shall yield to any one who desires to ask any questions.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am curious about one aspect of this matter. The

program of training under private auspices is not necessarily keyed or anchored to any one contract. That program is a continuing one. In other words, it goes from one contract and merges into the period of another contract. I understand the Senator from Tennessee to say that the private contractors are allowed 2 percent under the private contract training program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BONE. That cannot be charged to any one contract, because the training program is a continuing program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Whether it can or not, it is charged to the Government of the United States, which is paying the 2 percent.

Mr. BONE. That leads me to inquire—and it has to do with taxation—how the question is handled for purposes of income tax. Are the private companies allowed cost plus a fixed fee?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is asking something which is entirely outside my realm of knowledge.

Mr. BONE. I understand that, but the Senator is on a committee which has to do with financing the operations, and I am curious to know what happens to the 2 percent.

Mr. McKELLAR. My understanding is that it is taken out of the tax equation. That is a credit to the taxpayer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On this very matter of 2 percent, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I learned a moment ago from my distinguished friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] that the letter which I thought came from an educator in Rhode Island, is actually from Administrator McNutt. I know, of course, that Mr. McNutt has not only asserted but maintained and got away with the principle that he was entitled to assess every employee of the State of Indiana 2 percent. The 2 percent the Senator from Washington is talking about is very suggestive. I should like to know whether Mr. McNutt is to be entitled to assess everyone connected with the National Youth Administration 2 percent for his own political purposes? When the Senator from Washington brings up the subject of 2 percent it is extremely reminiscent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was about to say that I do not think the same law prevails nationally that prevails locally in the State of Indiana.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will Paul be able to shake down the National Youth Administration employees in the same way he did the State employees in Indiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think he will do that under any circumstances.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to say to the able Senator from Missouri, that if the distinguished Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Mr. McNutt, will

lift the odor of the Two-Percent Club away from Indiana, our citizens will be highly favored.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BONE. My friend the Senator from Missouri raises an interesting question. If the Government pays this 2 percent, is it allowed as an operating overhead in the way of expense; and if such is the case, is the private concern allowed a profit? And if so, how is it figured? I do not know how it is figured, or if it is allowed, but I am curious about it. I hope my brethren will not indulge in badinage about the matter, because, as I recall the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, it represents quite a sizeable sum of money.

Mr. McKELLAR. A good deal of money, yes; more than I or the Senator from Washington possess.

Mr. BONE. If there is a profit paid on it I wonder about that matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. On all contracts, 2 percent is allowed. I think the industries use that money for the purpose of training boys. I know they will not take boys trained simply by the N. Y. A. They must undergo the regular training the Government furnishes through the industry.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I should like to answer the distinguished Senator from Tennessee with respect to the 2 percent. It has nothing to do with the campaign funds in Indiana, I am happy to say. Industries which receive contracts for war work, if they need it, are allowed a credit of 2 percent for training. The total money spent for the war effort is the figure on which the Senator based his estimate of \$2,000,000,000. I venture to say that there have not been more than two or three hundred million dollars spent for this purpose, and that the better the people are trained who go to work for war industries, the less of the 2 percent it is necessary to spend. That is the reason for this N. Y. A. training program.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not the testimony which was given before the two committees.

Mr. TRUMAN. But those are the facts, I will say to the Senator, and I know them to be the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. They may be the facts.

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not want to be placed in the ridiculous position of voting for the amendment solely on the basis of what has been stated by the Senator from Tennessee with respect to the N. Y. A. In Florida the National Youth Administration war production training program is regularly preparing 1,200 youths in 35 shop units at 8 locations in the State, and is sending them into war industries having critical labor

shortages. In Florida alone, more than 2,300 boys and girls have gone from N. Y. A. shops to war-production lines in the first 10 months of the current fiscal year.

I do not know what the situation is in other States, but in Florida the N. Y. A. has done a most important job from the time when it was instituted. All its program is now devoted to war work. I cannot sit here and see this matter go to a vote on the basis of the ridiculous situation which has been represented in the last few minutes. I have no right at all to dispute what has been stated, but the condition which has been described does not exist in my State.

In order to save time, since I can speak for only a few minutes, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement only two pages long printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION IN FLORIDA

In Florida, the National Youth Administration war production training program is preparing 1,200 youths regularly in 35 shop units at 8 locations in the State, and sending them into war industries having critical labor shortages. Over 2,300 boys and girls in Florida alone have gone from National Youth Administration shops to war production lines in the first 10 months of the current fiscal year.

In the fall of 1938 and well before general preparation for defense, National Youth Administration began encouraging extensive development of production shops as work projects for youth, anticipating with accuracy the need for new workers trained in the metal and mechanical trades and taking the lead in preparing young women in such trades. At strategic locations in Florida, National Youth Administration construction workers erected adequate shop buildings under a standard pattern for production work.

Machine tools discarded by the Navy and other agencies as of no further value were secured by the National Youth Administration, rebuilt by the youth under competent journeyman supervision, and set up in the shops for production work. Such money as could be set aside in the budget was used to purchase new machine tools at a time when there was no demand for them by industry.

Adjacent to the shop centers in Florida, the National Youth Administration built or secured resident facilities, in order to bring to the shops young people living too far away to travel each day between home and shop. Now, the State has major centers located at Plant City, Pensacola, Miami, and Ocala, with feeder units located at Tallahassee, Jacksonville, and Orlando. The State-wide Negro center in Florida is located at Daytona Beach.

At the large resident work locations, youth are housed in dormitories and furnished food, necessary medical attention, and emergency hospitalization. On their own time and on a voluntary basis, youth assist supervisory employees in the preparation and serving of food, laundering, the maintenance and beautification of buildings and grounds, and the conduct of recreational activities. Youth thus share certain responsibilities for the operation of these centers and help to provide facilities which improve conditions of community living. Sparsely populated areas in Florida make it almost impossible to find sufficient nonagricultural workers in

any one section to carry on an economic non-resident training program. The resident facilities make it possible to offer National Youth Administration war production training to all eligible youth in the State.

The 35 shop units at the 8 work locations mentioned above provide 777 work stations in 10 occupations having critical labor shortages, including the metal trades—welding, machine, sheet metal, auto mechanics, forge, aviation mechanics, and related trades. Work experience is also provided in radio, joinery, clerical, and electrical occupations. The use of these work stations for 1 to 3 shifts a day provides for training about 1,200 youth at a time, two-thirds of whom are given subsistence at the resident centers. The average stay at the project is from 8 to 12 weeks.

The youth work in the shops on 8-hour shifts 6 days a week. Nearly half of the youth are girls and the ratio of girls is climbing steadily. Each shop is set up along industrial lines and is a unit where actual production work is performed. This makes it possible to train youth under the same conditions which they will experience when they go into private industry. The work the youth do is production mainly for war agencies, although some production is done for local public sponsors. The orders are: Ocala, 2,051 caps for smoke pipes for United States Army, Camp Blanding, Fla., and 282 steel ship ladders for United States Maritime Commission; Miami, production work for 10 aptitude tests for Army Air Force Technical Training Command, Miami, Fla.; Plant City, 1,200 rail connectors, No. 15, for Maritime Commission, and 1,175 spark arresters for Army Air Force, Boca Raton Field, Boca Raton, Fla.

During the period from July 1, 1942, to May 31, 1943, in Florida, approximately 2,300 youth were trained and placed in jobs in war industries, in other concerns doing work related to the war effort, and in Government service. This means that each work station has trained youth for industry, excluding the present employment of 1,200 youth. It is interesting to note that the projects in Florida have been so successful in gearing their activities to the Nation's war effort that it is now possible for a youth to know the name of the war industry that will employ him on completion of his training. The war industries now depend upon a weekly quota of newly trained workers from these facilities.

On completion of their training in Florida National Youth Administration shops, youth are often transferred to National Youth Administration induction centers, which are located near war industries. Under National Youth Administration's induction center program, youth are given their initial training in a N. Y. A. shop near their home community; then transferred on a voluntary basis to another National Youth Administration center in a labor-shortage area. While youth are undergoing their final 2 weeks of training in the new location, the United States Employment Service finds war jobs for them. The United States Employment Service maintains contacts with war industries and is instrumental in placing youth in industry as soon as their training is completed. Industries in which Florida National Youth Administration trained youth have been placed include Wainwright Shipbuilding Co., Panama City, Fla.; Alabama Dry Docks, Mobile, Ala.; Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Chickasaw, Ala.; Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.

Assignment of youth to the respective projects is handled by several workers stationed in the counties served by the projects. They work closely with the United States Employment Service and local citizens, and recruit out-of-school young women and young men

not likely to be drafted and who do not have available other means of preparation for war industry employment. Only youth between the ages of 16 and 24 are employed. Extreme caution is taken to avoid affecting adversely the farm labor situation.

Local advisory committees, composed of 131 community leaders and representative citizens, advise with National Youth Administration project officials and help to interpret the program in their vicinities. Many youths are referred to individual projects through local advisory committees.

Health examinations are given National Youth Administration youth through arrangement with private physicians and public health officials. In the first 11 months of this fiscal year, National Youth Administration in Florida gave physical examinations to 3,639 youth, revealing a variety of conditions requiring attention.

The average cost per youth per month for the program in Florida, including management, recruiting, direct shop supervision, food, lodging, and health service, 24-hour supervision at resident centers, shop operations expenses, work clothes, property and transportation, and youth wages, is about \$66.

From July 1942 through April 1943 the National Youth Administration war production training projects in Florida produced goods, excluding a large ship-ladder order for the Maritime Commission, for the United States Army, Navy and marines, which saved these organizations the sum of \$17,397.07.

No picture of National Youth Administration's wartime activities would be complete without mention of the student work program, which enables students to continue properly their education by the performance of useful work. The student work program has enabled 1,633 youth in Florida to continue their education in 261 Florida institutions this fiscal year. The students are enrolled in secondary schools, colleges, and universities, both public and private, tax-exempt, non-profit-making institutions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply want to call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the report of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, at page 10. In Florida the total number of work stations was 740. Six hundred and fifty-four were in use on October 28, 1942. Eighty-six were not in use.

The percentage of those not in use was 12 percent. The number of youths trained was 983.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me again, let me say in regard to the statement just made by the Senator from Tennessee that a station can be one lathe. Only 35 different shops are being used. As I have just said, a station can be one lathe or one machine.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Certain excerpts from letters written by persons in Kentucky appear in the report of the Byrd committee. The excerpts are very short. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point, and I desire to comment for a moment on

one of them. The one to which I refer was written by Harper Gatton, superintendent of the Madisonville city schools, at Madisonville, Ky. Mr. Gatton said:

The National Youth Administration work is a duplicate of effort in this area. Busses are hauling children 35 miles through Madisonville to Providence now for the National Youth Administration course. All of these children could take the same type of courses in our regular school work in Madisonville at much less cost and expense.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me; and if there is no objection, I should like to have the excerpts referred to printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is my considered opinion that the National Youth Administration set-up as now maintained is contrary to the best interest of the people of this country.

The training given by the National Youth Administration is a duplicate of the training given in our public schools and consequently is in direct competition with them. The result is that neither program is as efficient as it would be if under a single administrative agency. The public-school system as maintained in our States is the proper place for the control and administration of the National Youth Administration program.

At the present time the National Youth Administration is enticing from the high schools and grade schools boys and girls that by all standards should remain in public schools. These students are taken away from home and housed under conditions that cannot be as satisfactory as home conditions. (V. O. Turner, principal, Maytown Consolidated School, Langley, Ky., January 29, 1943.)

As a result of the present emergency, when our people are having the heaviest tax burden in our history imposed upon them, they are naturally becoming much more concerned about the manner in which this money is spent by their Government. I do not wish to stipulate that our people object to taxes, however steep they may be, so long as the money obtained is used wisely in preserving our American way of living.

The general public sentiment today is becoming more and more critical of the misuse of Federal funds in promotion of such organizations as the now abolished Work Projects Administration and the still-existing National Youth Administration. The prevalent sentiment is that the present National Youth Administration is in direct competition with and a duplication of the efforts of our public and vocational school systems. There is not the slightest reason to doubt that with the equipment and money allotted to the National Youth Administration our public schools would do a far better job than any such organization.

I have personally made a study of the activities of the National Youth Administration by direct contact for the past year. In a recent study, I found 42 percent of the trainees enrolled in one shop to be under 18 years of age and the average grade level of this group to be seven. The only logical assumption we can make is that these boys and girls have been enticed away from the public schools and from under home influence, where they rightfully belong. (Fred A. Martin, coordinator, Prestonburg Shop, Mayo State Vocational School, Prestonburg, Ky., January 31, 1943.)

The National Youth Administration work is a duplicate of effort in this area. Busses are hauling children 35 miles through Madisonville to Providence now for the National Youth Administration course. All of these children could take the same type of courses in our regular school work in Madisonville at much less cost and expense.

I understand that in the United States there are 50,000 National Youth Administration training stations, but not that many trainees. It has been our observation that many of the trainees from the National Youth Administration school at Providence have been turned down by the employers of labor at Evansville because they are not 18 years of age. It has also come to our attention that the training which is given to the trainees in this shop is not particularly helpful to them after they enter industry.

No reason has ever been presented to me why better learning could not be obtained in public schools at less training cost and expense. (Harper Gatton, superintendent, Madisonville city schools, Madisonville, Ky., January 19, 1943.)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few minutes. As the chairman of the subcommittee having the bill in charge, the matter was presented to the subcommittee, the House having stricken the item from the bill. Hearings extending over a day or more were held. I approached the subject with entire impartiality. I had no prejudice on the subject at all. The records show that my State is entirely out of the picture; in other words, nothing has gone to the State of Nevada as a result of the N. Y. A. activity.

If the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House are duty-bound to attempt to curtail national expenditures, here is one place where the Senate can support its committee by curtailing expenditures. If, on the other hand, we are not bound to curtail expenditures, if we are to spend and spend and spend, and tax and tax and tax, as has been said by certain persons in high places, then of course the Senate can sustain the proposed amendment.

The question has been asked, Is there a duplication of effort? That is what we in Appropriation Committees are looking for all the time; we are constantly endeavoring to find out whether there is duplication of action, by reason of which \$2 is expended where \$1 might do the work. Let me say in all sincerity that the Byrd report—I am not dealing with a report of my own committee; I am dealing with the report made by the Joint Committee of the Senate and House—shows a duplication of action, as is disclosed on pages 2 and 3 of the report. Let us remember that this agency was set up under the Work Progress Administration. It was set up by Executive order, not by statute. It was set up for a defined and limited purpose. I read now the Executive order and the purpose set out in it, as was detailed by the Senator from Wyoming just a few moments ago:

To initiate and administer a program of approved projects which shall provide re-

lief, work relief, and employment for persons between the ages of 16 and 25 years who are no longer in regular attendance at a school requiring full time and who are not regularly engaged in remunerative employment.

That was the object and purpose of setting up the N. Y. A. in the first instance.

Now it is said that the N. Y. A. has become a war training program, that it is indispensable to the war effort. Mr. President, I can say to you from observation extending over many years, some 10 years of them on the Appropriations Committee, that there is not a single agency which ever comes before the Appropriations Committee that does not justify its items on the ground that it is essential to the war effort and to the prosecution of the war. The Fish and Wildlife Service has spent hours before the Appropriations Committee outlining how it is indispensable to the prosecution of the war. The record will bear out my statement.

As a matter of fact the N. Y. A. is no more essential to the prosecution of the war than is the Fish and Wildlife Service. Why do I say that? Because the very training so much relied upon in the debate for the war effort is being duplicated by agency after agency, with appropriation after appropriation, most of which is in the very bill now under consideration.

Let me read them to you.

First, Training Within Industry Service. That is under this very bill. I read from the list printed in the report:

1. Training Within Industry Service advises on over-all on-the-job training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through specific training programs for supervisors, instructors, and training directors.

For the current year, \$1,145,000.

2. Apprentice and Training Service advises on over-all training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through development of complete training programs which provide on-the-job training coordinated with the training services supplied by other agencies.—\$915,501.

That is in this bill.

3. Vocational Training for War Production Workers (formerly Vocation Education, National Defense), United States Office of Education, in cooperation with State and local vocational schools, is specifically assigned to give training of less than college grade to war production workers.—\$14,301,140.

Do Senators say that there is no duplication? Look at the very bill before us.

4. Vocational Training for Rural War Production Workers, in cooperation with State boards for vocational education and local departments of vocational agriculture, is specifically assigned to give training of less than college grade in the production of farm commodities and in the repair, operation, and construction of farm machinery and equipment.—\$15,000,000.

Is there no duplication?

5. Engineering, Science, and Management War Training, United States Office of Edu-

cation, in cooperation with colleges and universities, is specifically assigned to offer training of college grade in engineering, chemistry, physics, and production supervision to train professional and technical workers for war industries.—\$30,000,000.

Do Senators say there is no duplication? These programs are in the very bill before us.

6. National Youth Administration is specifically assigned to provide training to unemployed, out-of-school youth between the ages of 16 and 25, in skills required in war industries.

7. The United States Employment Service is specifically assigned to deal with labor supply, make recommendations regarding training needs and on the most effective use of personnel in terms of the prevailing and anticipated labor requirements. The Employment Service will direct industry to the service assigned to give the training assistance needed.—\$2,467,670.

The total is \$125,103,311. Every item I have read is a duplication of the very activity set out in the N. Y. A. item.

Mr. President, I approach this subject without the least degree of prejudice. I have no prejudice whatever. It does not affect me in the least. I speak before the Senate only to support the will of the Committee on Appropriations, which said that in keeping with the will of the House of Representatives this item should go out of this bill, because somewhere along the line we must curtail just a little, even though it be only \$48,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. It is said that the N. Y. A. should be continued for another year. If it goes on for another year, we can rest assured that it will do just as it did this year when we tried to eliminate it, and last year. It will have another excuse for going on with all these training programs, now being paid for by the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. To say that this agency should go on, when it is duplicated six times over, is to say that we will willfully spend this money, regardless of duplication, regardless of whether or not it is being duplicated \$6 for \$1 all the way down the line.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that besides the \$125,103,311 which has been stated by the Senator from Nevada, the War Department bill carries many more millions of dollars for the purpose of training engineers, doctors, dentists, veterinarians, and others?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is absolutely correct. Furthermore, as has been stated here time and again this afternoon, 2 percent is allowed to industry for training. The record before the committee shows that institutions which employ persons who are trained by N. Y. A. insist that they must be trained again before they can be put into industry. So industry demands, and is allowed, 2 percent for training. Where

the training actually takes place, as it must take place, 2 percent is allowed, and not otherwise.

So, in addition to the \$125,103,311 for a duplication of the services of N. Y. A., there are untold millions of dollars in the 2 percent. Someone has figured it up to be \$1,000,000,000. I do not know whether it is or not, but untold and unenumerated millions of dollars are provided for duplication of this very service.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Having this bill in charge, I approach the subject without the least degree of prejudice. The only prejudice I have in the whole matter is that I hope that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate may some time reach a point where we can have the support of the Senate to curtail expenditures, because if we do not do it, God only knows where expenditures will reach. It is time to stop. We cannot stop it all at once. Let us stop it little by little, one item at a time. Last year we put the C. C. C. out of business. I wonder if anyone will say that the C. C. C. did not do a valiant job when it was set up and operating. I do not think any Senator will utter one word of depreciation against the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Then we had the Work Relief Administration. That was an administration which did a splendid work in an hour of great need. Both those agencies went out under protest. First of all, the President did not want the Work Relief Administration to go out of business. Finally he put it out of business by an Executive order. Then he did not want the Civilian Conservation Corps to go out of business, but the Congress put it out of business. Now we are engaged in trying to cut down one more item—only \$48,000,000; but \$48,000,000 cut down now is \$48,000,000 which might be expended for a better purpose.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have listened to what the able Senator has said about the duplication of the program, and his reading from the enumeration of the various services rendering this kind of training, given on pages 2 and 3 of the Byrd Committee report.

I notice that item No. 3 relates to—

Vocational Training for War Production Workers (formerly Vocational Education, National Defense), United States Office of Education.

I notice that item No. 5 reads:

Engineering, Science and Management War Training, United States Office of Education.

I notice that item No. 7 reads:

The United States Employment Service.

My question is: Is it not a fact that the United States Office of Education and the United States Employment Service, together with the N. Y. A., are

all under the general control of the Federal Security Administrator?

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that that is true; in fact, I know it is true.

Mr. PEPPER. May we not assume, unless we attribute inefficiency to the Federal Security Administrator, that he would not allow, within his own agency, a duplication of facilities? I do not know what Mr. McNutt has recommended this year, if anything. I remember that last year, when the question of the abolition of the N. Y. A. was before the Congress, I was present on one occasion when the Federal Security Administrator appeared, and he distinctly informed the committee that there was no duplication, and that he was keeping the several agencies working in different fields. If he is doing his duty, I wonder if the able Senator would not assume that the various agencies are so coordinated that there is no duplication among them?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will answer that question by saying that I take the facts and let the conjectures go. Whether he is doing his duty or not is one thing. The facts speak for themselves. There is a duplication, five or six times over. That is the answer.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. A moment ago it was suggested that the War Department and the Navy Department had certain training programs in the universities and colleges. Earlier in the day I stated that I was directly informed this morning by Mr. Aubrey Williams that the N. Y. A. boys and girls who were receiving N. Y. A. aid in school or in college were not eligible for the training given by the War Department or the Navy Department. So if Mr. Williams correctly represented the matter to me, there is certainly no duplication in those programs between the Army and Navy V-12 program and the school and college aid program of the N. Y. A.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator does not find that activity on the list which I read.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator did not say it was; but it was suggested in the colloquy a few moments ago.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is useless to try to confuse the issue. I have read to the Senate a list of six agencies, every one of which is duplicating the work of the N. Y. A.—\$6 spent for \$1 of good accomplished, if there was \$1 of good accomplished.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In my remarks earlier in the day I read from a statement given me by Mr. Aubrey Williams. In that statement Mr. Williams flatly stated—again I rely on his own integrity—that where the N. Y. A. training program was being carried on there was no other service of the same kind available. For example, he took in, he said, boys and girls

from rural areas and from areas where the other phases of this character of training were not being carried on; so that there was no duplication.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no desire to speak disparagingly of the utterances of Mr. Aubrey Williams. I make the statement with the facts known to Mr. Aubrey Williams, and it is impossible for Mr. Aubrey Williams or anyone else to deny the facts, most of which are in the bill which is now before the Senate. Senators may read it. Senators have already approved the items of appropriation.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude with one further statement. I hope the amendment will not prevail. If it prevails today then we shall have thrown discouragement into the committee in its efforts to curtail day-by-day Government expenditures, so that some day the people of the Nation may say that Congress was trying to save and lighten the burden on the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement. I had not expected to say anything on this subject, but inasmuch as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], was under the impression that I had agreed to the report, I think I should make a statement.

I may have been present on the day when the report was under discussion. I heard no testimony this year on the report. When the distinguished Senator from Virginia filed the report, either on that day or the day subsequent, and when the Senator from Wisconsin rose in his place and asked that he be permitted to file minority views, I rose, as the RECORD shows, and stated that I did not agree to so much of the report as asked for the immediate ending of the N. Y. A., and that, while perhaps I would not file minority views, I wished my position to be understood.

I have no desire now to discuss the report except to say that last year, when an effort was made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, as he has detailed, to abolish the N. Y. A., a report was submitted by the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures especially directing the Senate's attention to the N. Y. A. program. Prior to that time this program had advanced in cost until it had reached approximately \$160,000,000 per annum, as I recall. There was a reduction in the program last year.

At that time I did not join in the report asking for the abandonment of the N. Y. A., but did subjoin to the report a statement agreeing in the main to many of the committee recommendations in the report, and to the findings of fact, but suggesting and urging that certain essential functions of the N. Y. A. be integrated with other services of the Government. That was not done; there was no attempt to do it; and I would be justified in voting now to abolish the N. Y. A. outright, because the authorities, in place of heeding the report of the committee, have deliberately plowed ahead and presented the same issue again this year.

Notwithstanding that fact, Mr. President, I did not join in the report—and I wish to make that clear—for only two substantial reasons: First, I am advised that the N. Y. A. has equipment totaling in value perhaps \$75,000,000. As I have said, I have been told that. To abandon the N. Y. A. would be virtually to lose the use of that material, because I know that machinery and equipment will not be transferred to any other vocational training school. I shall explain that statement in a moment.

Also, if this machinery and equipment should be transferred to any other vocational training school, where I think it ought now to be used, there would necessarily be a time lag. I felt that we ought not to abandon the N. Y. A., destroy it now, terminate it at this moment, or at the end of this fiscal year, which is just a day or so ahead of us, with the consequent loss of this machinery, or the loss of the use of a vast investment of the Government in the machinery.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suppose the Senator has been advised that in the bill as it came from the House, and in its present form, there is an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for the liquidation of the N. Y. A.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct. I appreciate that fact. However, there is no effort made in the House bill to transfer this machinery to any other training facility, and there would be a time lag which I am unwilling to believe the country should stand at this time.

Mr. President, I desire to make a further statement. The N. Y. A. in my State has done good work. It has rendered a service to a great many people in the State who needed assistance, and needed the precise service which was rendered. I think that due respect to the findings of the committees a year ago should have led to the integration in other agencies of the functions of the N. Y. A. which should have been preserved. On that point I am perfectly clear.

Mr. President, I happen to have been the author of three of the four vocational educational bills which became law in this country within my lifetime. A bill was introduced by me which put vocational education on a permanent basis, and called for an annual appropriation. The money which has been wasted all the way down from Mr. Hopkins' early administration through the various training programs would have established vocational education in America worthy of this great Nation, yet I regret to say that it early became obvious to me that the money could not go where I thought it should go.

I have never been a great advocate of the Federal Government contributing to our ordinary local educational institutions, but I did strongly favor vocational education, and participation in the program by the Federal Government, because it was a contribution to but one department of an established school system, and that could never be Federally controlled if we adhered to the salutary principle I have stated.

Year after year I have seen appropriated many millions of dollars which, in my humble judgment, should have gone into the vocational training schools in all the institutions of our States, in which case we would long since have had a vocational educational system which would have been of permanent benefit to the Nation. But when we finish with it, we will come face to face with the situation that, beginning 8 or 9 years ago, we can trace a great deal of money which has been used for a semivocational educational purpose, totaling many million dollars, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars, yet the vocational educational system has stood still, and at some future day, when the war ends, the whole work must be taken up again if we are really to accomplish any worth-while purpose.

Mr. President, since the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], seemed to have been under the impression that I was present, or that I assented to the report, I wanted to say that I did not agree to the report asking for the immediate dissolution of N. Y. A., principally for the two reasons which I have stated. I have declared all the while that I would vote for a reasonable appropriation to continue the work of the N. Y. A. under existing circumstances.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am very sorry indeed I misstated the position of the Senator from Georgia, and I know he will realize my error was entirely inadvertent. As I recall, the Senator from Georgia was present at the meeting when the report was adopted, and, so far as I heard, made no dissent from it. I was not informed that when the Senator from Wisconsin submitted his minority views, on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Georgia stated that he was not in favor of the report of the committee. I hope the Senator will understand that my statement in response to the question of the Senator from Tennessee was entirely inadvertent.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, I know it was.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word with regard to the amendment before the vote is taken.

I have received several letters from North Carolina asking that I vote for the continuation of the N. Y. A. I realize that a number of the letters were from people who were directly interested in the continuation of the N. Y. A.; whereas there were letters from parties who were not directly interested.

I realize that the N. Y. A. has done a pretty good work in North Carolina, but, on the other hand, I realize that outside North Carolina the N. Y. A. has been a miserable failure.

I think Mr. Aubrey Williams heads the N. Y. A. under the direction of Mr. Harry Hopkins. I understand that Mr. Hopkins, who directs Mr. Williams, is very anxious that Mr. Williams be continued in office, but I do not feel that I

can conscientiously cast a vote here today for Mr. Hopkins to continue Mr. Williams in office. I do not know how much Mr. Williams receives a year, but I do not feel that I can vote \$45,000,000 to continue Mr. Aubrey Williams in office.

Consequently, Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am sorry he offered the amendment, because I dislike very much to vote against any amendment he proposes, recognizing that he is chairman of about the finest committee we ever had in Washington since the creation of Congress. But from a sense of patriotic duty I shall have to eliminate all personal considerations at this time, and instead of voting in favor of Mr. TRUMAN, as I should very much like to do, I shall vote against Mr. Hopkins, against Mr. Williams, and in favor of the United States of America. Therefore I shall have to vote against the amendment of the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter from Mr. Aubrey Williams, and a table which shows the number of machines in use and the number of people working on those machines.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
June 28, 1943.
Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: Among the charges that Senator BYRD may make is that the National Youth Administration in the early part of the fiscal year had a substantial number of idle, unused work stations. The Byrd report has erroneously charged that the National Youth Administration in January 1943 had some 56,000 work stations, of which approximately 39,000 were in use, leaving, as the Byrd report assumed, a total of 17,000 idle work stations. The facts, nevertheless, are that following a sharp reduction in our appropriation we of necessity had to take out of operation 17,000 work stations, so that by January 8, 1943, equipment representing 16,814 work stations was not in use. However, in accordance with existing requirements regarding disposal of surplus property, the status of this equipment was as follows:

Loaned to non-Federal agencies and subject to recall (schools).....	4,675
Declared as surplus to the Treasury Procurement Officer for disposition.....	5,184
Equipment listed on declaration of surplus documents in process of transfer to Treasury Procurement.....	1,468
Equipment transferred to other agencies.....	3,260
Equipment in process of transfer to new work locations.....	2,227
Total.....	16,814

There is attached hereto a table as of February 24, 1943, which is about the time that Senator BYRD released his charge. The table shows the number of work stations (a work station consists of a machine or a bench and working space for one individual), in use

and the number of trainees based upon a nose count of those actually present in the shop on that date. In this connection it should be noted that an individual trainee is at a work station for 8 hours each day. Of course, the really significant fact is that all of the 39,000 work stations which were retained after the declaration of surplus property are in use and that through their use the National Youth Administration is turning out 60,000 trainees every 60 days, 40,000 to 45,000 of whom go into war-production industry.

Sincerely yours,

AUBREY WILLIAMS,
Administrator.

National Youth Administration: Number of active work stations and number of trainees receiving training, as of Feb. 24, 1943

Region and State	Total number of work stations	Number of youth under active assignment
Grand total.....	39,281	59,055
Region I (total).....	4,584	5,728
Connecticut.....	280	385
Maine.....	519	752
Massachusetts.....	826	931
New Hampshire.....	102	142
Rhode Island.....	25	28
Vermont.....	233	187
New York.....	2,599	3,303
Region III (total).....	3,684	7,799
Delaware.....	24	63
New Jersey.....	601	854
Pennsylvania.....	3,059	6,882
Region IV (total).....	3,368	6,228
District of Columbia.....	169	287
Maryland.....	390	561
North Carolina.....	1,080	2,243
Virginia.....	828	1,235
West Virginia.....	901	1,402
Region V (total).....	4,304	7,774
Kentucky.....	1,121	2,404
Michigan.....	1,480	2,492
Ohio.....	1,703	2,878
Region VI (total).....	6,370	8,226
Illinois.....	2,522	4,425
Indiana.....	1,105	1,516
Wisconsin.....	2,743	2,285
Region VII (total).....	4,614	6,916
Alabama.....	882	1,258
Florida.....	805	1,102
Georgia.....	1,104	1,919
Mississippi.....	696	990
South Carolina.....	357	787
Tennessee.....	870	860
Region VIII (total).....	2,758	3,414
Iowa.....	1,033	907
Minnesota.....	1,005	1,438
Nebraska.....	273	304
North Dakota.....	164	354
South Dakota.....	283	411
Region IX (total).....	4,748	6,131
Arkansas.....	717	1,588
Kansas.....	785	875
Missouri.....	1,102	1,514
Oklahoma.....	2,144	2,154
Region X (total).....	2,507	4,360
Louisiana.....	501	1,010
New Mexico.....	112	192
Texas.....	1,894	3,158
Region XI (total).....	1,273	1,272
Colorado.....	339	289
Idaho.....	383	443
Montana.....	112	134
Utah.....	263	291
Wyoming.....	176	110

National Youth Administration: Number of active work stations and number of trainees receiving training, as of Feb. 24, 1943—Continued

Region and State	Total number of work stations	Number of youth under active assignment
Region XII (total).....	1,071	1,207
Arizona.....	86	154
California.....	564	620
Nevada.....
Oregon.....	190	250
Washington.....	231	183

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after line 20, on page 65, down to and including line 13, on page 66, and insert the following:

PAR. 1. Youth work: For all expenses necessary to enable the National Youth Administration, which is hereby extended to and including June 30, 1944, under the supervision and direction of the War Manpower Commission, to provide employment and work training for young persons of the ages of 16 to 24, inclusive, on workshop and other projects approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as needed in the prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment in occupations in which there is a present or potential shortage of labor, \$35,000,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for youth work, National Youth Administration, 1943. This appropriation shall be available for the payment of project supervisory employees; the procurement and maintenance of project facilities by contract or otherwise, including the purchase of materials, supplies, and equipment; purchase of 215 passenger-carrying automobiles; operation of resident facilities; travel expenses (not to exceed \$918,000) for travel of supervisory employees in the performance of their official duties, and transportation of trainees to, from, and between projects, including the transfer of trainees to induction projects for the purpose of placing such trainees in war production industries; and the examination of applicants for training to determine their physical fitness for subsequent employment.

PAR. 2. To provide continuance of part-time employment for needy young persons in colleges and universities, to enable such persons to continue their education, \$4,000,000, together with not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for part-time employment of students, National Youth Administration, 1943.

PAR. 3. Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary for carrying out the general administration of the programs set forth in paragraph 1 and paragraph 2, including not to exceed \$250,000 for travel expenses, \$2,750,000.

PAR. 4. Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the National Youth Administration, \$50,000.

PAR. 5. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration shall, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, fix the monthly earnings and hours of work for trainees engaged on work projects financed in whole or in part from the appropriation in paragraph 1, but such determination shall not have the effect of establishing a national average labor cost per trainee on such projects during the fiscal

year 1944 substantially different from the national average labor cost per such trainee on such projects prevailing at the close of the fiscal year 1943. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is hereby authorized to fix monthly hours of work for uncompensated trainees who are employed in and whose wages are paid by private industrial concerns but who receive training through use of project facilities as authorized in paragraph 7 hereafter.

PAR. 6. Funds appropriated under paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending June 30, 1944, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished during such period for the purposes set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2.

PAR. 7. The National Youth Administration is authorized to receive reimbursements from other Federal or non-Federal public agencies for the use of facilities and for the cost of materials, and contributions for the operation of projects from Federal or non-Federal agencies in the form of services, materials, or money; any money so received to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the contributing agency and the National Youth Administration and such reimbursements shall be available for the purposes of this appropriation. Workshop facilities and personal services of project supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration may be made available for training of individuals who are employed in and whose wages for such training are paid by private industrial concerns engaged in the production of war materials or equipment: *Provided, however*, That individuals receiving such training shall not be entitled to wage or salary payments from any funds appropriated herein.

PAR. 8. The facilities and services of the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission shall be utilized wherever possible in the selection and referral of trainees for employment and work training on projects of the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 9. No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 and no part of the money appropriated in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit that he is a citizen of the United States, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship. This paragraph shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines or to persons who have been honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

PAR. 10. No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, and no compensated or uncompensated person shall receive assistance in the form of payments, training, or otherwise from the United States for services rendered under the National Youth Administration, under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 unless such person before engaging in such employment or receiving such assistance subscribes to the following oath:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God."

PAR. 11. Compensated and uncompensated administrative and supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration, designated for the purpose by the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representative, shall have the general powers of notaries public in the administration of oaths required by paragraphs 9 and 10 and the execution and acknowledgment of other legal instruments, and all forms of notarial acts determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary for the effective prosecution of the National Youth Administration programs. No fee shall be charged for oaths administered by such employees.

PAR. 12. No person who refuses prior to employment to agree that he will accept employment in industry related to national defense if and when offered in good faith shall be eligible for employment on any project of the National Youth Administration. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to uncompensated trainees who are employed in and who are paid by private industrial concerns.

PAR. 13. No portion of the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

PAR. 14. No portion of the appropriations in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee, except persons so appointed who are already employed by another agency of the Government and are assigned or detailed to the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 15. In carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representatives, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; to appoint and compensate officers and employees without regard to civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed, Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State or local government, State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary without regard to other laws governing the employment and compensation of Federal employees.

PAR. 16. Appointments in any State to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriation in paragraph 3 shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

PAR. 17. In making separations from the Federal service, or furloughs without pay to last as long as 3 months, of persons employed within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of paragraph 3, the appointing power shall give preference, as nearly as good administration will warrant, in retention to appointees from States that have not received their share of appointments according to population: *Provided, however*, That soldiers and sailors and marines, the widows of such, or the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines, who themselves are not qualified, but whose wives are qualified to hold a position in the Government service, shall be given preference in retention, in their several grades and classes, where their ratings are good or better.

PAR. 18. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits, shall apply to persons receiving compensation from the appropriation in paragraph 1 for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply in any case com-

ing within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death: *Provided further*, That for carrying out the purposes of this paragraph there shall be made available to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission from the appropriation in such paragraph 1 the sum of \$86,000, or so much thereof as such Commission, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, estimates and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury will be necessary for such purposes.

PAR. 19. The funds appropriated by paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for emergency hospitalization and medical care, by reimbursement to Government hospitals or by contract with other public or private hospitals, in cases of critical illness or injury, of compensated trainees, who are full-time residents of projects involving the maintenance of trainees in camps or other resident facilities under the supervision of the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 20. If the death of any trainee, employed and compensated from funds provided under paragraph 1 hereof, occurs while such trainee is in transit to or in residence at such camp or other resident facility mentioned in paragraph 19 hereof, or while undergoing hospital treatment except for injuries sustained under conditions which are covered by the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act as provided for in paragraph 18 hereof, the funds appropriated under paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for the payment of necessary expenses of preparation of the body for burial, interment, or cremation (not to exceed a total of \$100 in any one case), and for transportation of the remains, including round-trip transportation and subsistence of an escort, to the home of the decedent, or to such other place as relatives of the decedent may designate if the distance to such other place be not greater than the distance to the home of the decedent: *Provided*, That when the expenses of the preparation and disposition of the remains, or any part of such expenses, are paid by individuals, such individuals may be reimbursed therefor.

PAR. 21. The National Youth Administrator, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the appropriation in paragraph 1 any claim arising out of operations thereunder accruing after June 30, 1943, on account of damage to, or loss of, privately owned property caused by the negligence of any employee of the National Youth Administration, while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of \$500 or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

PAR. 22. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any project authorized in paragraph 1, diverts, or attempts to divert, or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of the appropriations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, or 4 or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives, or attempts to deprive, or assists in depriving any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under such appropriation, shall be deemed

guilty of a felony and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

PAR. 23. All training or educational programs other than work and training on the project location incidental to the supervision of a work program being conducted thereon for youth employed by the National Youth Administration on work projects shall be under the control and supervision of the State boards for vocational education of the several States and shall be paid for out of appropriations made to the Office of Education and expended by the States pursuant to plans submitted by State boards for vocational education and approved by the Commissioner of Education.

PAR. 24. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase with funds appropriated for the National Youth Administration when the aggregate amount involved in such purchase does not exceed the sum of \$300.

PAR. 25. Whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine that the facilities of any shop project of the National Youth Administration can contribute more effectively to the prosecution of the war if operated by another department or agency of the Government, or by another public agency, he may direct the transfer of such facilities to such department or agency.

PAR. 26. Property and facilities which are declared surplus to the needs of the program as provided in paragraph 1 may be transferred, upon such terms as may be approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, but without cost to the United States for transportation or otherwise, to school districts, municipalities, counties, States, or other non-Federal public agencies, without regard to other Federal law or regulation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who would vote "nay," is

paired on this question with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who would vote "nay," has a pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—41

Atken	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hayden	Overton
Bankhead	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bilbo	Kilgore	Scruggam
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Truman
Davis	McFarland	Van Nuys
Downey	Maybank	Wagner
George	Mead	Wallgren
Green	Murdock	White
Guffey	Murray	

NAYS—37

Ball	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bridges	Holman	Robertson
Brooks	McCarran	Smith
Buck	McClellan	Stewart
Butler	McKellar	Taft
Byrd	Maloney	Tunnell
Chandler	Millikin	Vandenberg
Chavez	Moore	Wheeler
Danaher	Nye	Wherry
Eastland	O'Daniel	Willis
Ferguson	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gerry	Reed	
Gurney	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—18

Austin	Clark, Idaho	McNary
Bailey	Connally	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Ellender	Tobey
Brewster	Gillette	Tydings
Burton	Glass	Walsh
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Wiley

So Mr. TRUMAN's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of my colleague was agreed to.

Mr. TRUMAN. I move to lay the motion of the Senator from Missouri on the table.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TRUMAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TRUMAN. Is a vote "yea" a vote to table the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A vote "yea" is a vote to lay on the table the motion made by the senior Senator from Missouri.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who would vote "nay," has a pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from

Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who would vote "nay," is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—41

Alken	Hayden	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Barkley	Kilgore	Scruggam
Bilbo	La Follette	Shipstead
Bone	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Davis	McFarland	Tunnell
Downey	Maybank	Van Nuys
George	Mead	Wagner
Green	Murdock	Wallgren
Guffey	Murray	White
Hatch	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—37

Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bridges	Hawkes	Reynolds
Brooks	Holman	Robertson
Buck	McCarran	Smith
Butler	McClellan	Stewart
Eyrd	McKellar	Taft
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Millikin	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wherry
Danaher	Nye	Willis
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wilson
Ferguson	Radcliffe	
Gerry	Reed	

NOT VOTING—18

Austin	Clark, Idaho	McNary
Bailey	Connally	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Ellender	Tobey
Brewster	Gillette	Tydings
Burton	Glass	Walsh
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Wiley

So Mr. TRUMAN's motion to lay on the table the motion of Mr. CLARK of Missouri to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Any funds available to the United States Public Health Service for the treatment of patients may be used, upon the request of State and local health authorities, to provide for the hospitalization, treatment, and subsistence in hospital facilities operated by the United States Public Health Service of Selective Service registrants infected with venereal disease, and for the transportation of such Selective Service registrants between their homes and such facilities when necessary.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, at the present time it is estimated that there are, among the 21,000,000 males aged 18 through 37 years, nearly 1,000,000 cases of syphilis. Among the 2,000,000 Negro population in this age group there are 524,000 cases; among the 19,000,000 whites there are 428,000, according to the best estimates available. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an exhibit which shows the basis of the estimates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is not definitely known how many men in these age groups have already had blood tests. However, it is believed that as of this date 15,000,000 men have already been tested as a result of the Selective Service mass blood testing program. On this basis, if the results on the first 2,000,000 men tested and on subsequent samples are representative, 750,000 men with evidence of syphilis have been revealed as a result of those examinations.

Present programs as carried out by State and local health departments have placed under treatment about 55 percent of the men revealed by the Selective Service blood tests as being infected. I ask unanimous consent that exhibit B, which bears on the foregoing, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator kindly to suspend until the Senate is in order; because the Senator's discussion should be listened to by the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am doing my best to make myself heard, and I may say that in my humble opinion there is nothing more important, in a minor way, to which the Senate could give its attention than this proposal.

In the past year, alone, the programs to which I have just referred have been stepped up by more than 20 percent.

That is indicated in exhibit C, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This is the important point: Prior to October 1942, the Army did not induct registrants with syphilis. Therefore, it was necessary for the civilian health authorities to give each individual with syphilis a minimum recommended schedule of therapy before he could even be considered for military service. Since October 1942, the Army has inducted registrants with uncomplicated syphilis, regardless of treatment, and the rate of such inductions is gradually increasing. But because prior to October 1942, the Army did not induct registrants who, except for the fact that they were shown to have syphilis, were otherwise qualified for military service, a great backlog of syphilitic eligibles for military service has been built up. It is contemplated that eventually a considerable portion of the million males with syphilis will be taken by the Army under this new plan.

Civilian health authorities, however, will still have to supply treatment to those persons who are not eligible for military service because of the late crippling manifestations of syphilis, or because of other defects, dependency, or essentiality, and because of a large number of Negro males who will not be in-

ducted because of racial quotas. Moreover, civilian health authorities and the United States Public Health Service, in order to control the spread of syphilis in civilian communities, are required to provide adequate treatment immediately upon the uncovering of syphilis in the individual.

Therefore, the amendment proposes that in areas where the civilian health authorities are overwhelmed with the numbers of infected registrants needing treatment, the local or State authorities may request the United States Public Health Service to provide treatment for those individuals in hospital facilities already established by the United States Public Health Service or put in operation to meet the need for that type of service. Once more I wish to emphasize the point that the persons who would receive treatment are persons who have been called for selective service, and who, insofar as we know, and generally speaking, have been rejected for the sole reason that they were infected with a curable venereal disease. Legal authorization is required to permit the work to be done. Legal authorization is also required to provide transportation of patients to and from their homes, when necessary. No need is anticipated in the immediate future for additional funds to carry out the provisions of this authorization, since the Hospital Division proposes to operate this program within the limit of already available beds, and additional facilities can be provided from funds appropriated by Congress under the provisions of the Lanham Act.

I desire to emphasize the point that the sole purpose of the amendment is to help the local and State authorities treat the unusually large number of syphilitic cases which have been revealed as a result of the Selective Service mass blood tests, and, by utilization of hospital facilities which are not now being utilized, to make those men ready for induction into the military service. In my opinion, to the extent that we can make these men available for military service, we will to that extent relieve the pressure upon persons who otherwise would have to be inducted. It is fair to assume that those who have thus far been called are largely those in the group of single men, or those without large numbers of dependents.

I hope that the Senator in charge of the bill will be willing to let this amendment go to conference. I apologize for having proposed it at this stage of the proceedings. My only defense is that these measures are moving along with such rapidity that it has been almost impossible for me to obtain an opportunity to present the matter through the regular channels.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What sums are available for the treatment of patients? Can the Senator indicate in which appropriations and on what page of the bill such funds are listed?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There are statutory provisions for the care of persons

who are provided with hospital service, such as those in the Maritime Service, and those treated by the Narcotic Service. The officer in charge of the hospital service informs me that there are certain vacancies in those hospitals which could be utilized for this purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator refer to the \$10,510,700 appropriation on pages 34 and 35?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, it is the funds which are available for persons who are entitled to statutory benefits, such as those who are in the Maritime Service, and those who are sent to the narcotic institutions for treatment. The funds will only be used where there are vacancies in existing facilities. I do not know whether the Senator is familiar with the situation, but there have been some very encouraging developments in the rapid treatment of syphilis, and it is hoped that these cases may be given the combination of fever and high arsphenamine dosages which are giving great hope of providing a new and much quicker method of treating syphilis.

Mr. TAFT. What I do not understand is why, if there is any money left over from any of the other appropriations, the appropriations are in that sum. If there is any money left over, it should have been cut off the appropriation. Therefore, it seems to me that if additional facilities are to be created, necessarily additional appropriations will be required.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is not my understanding of the situation.

Mr. TAFT. Then the Appropriations Committee has not done its duty. It should have cut down the appropriations for the other purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Merely because there is a vacancy of 25 or 30 beds in an institution at a particular time, we could not pare down the appropriation to represent the temporary nonuse of 25 or 30 beds.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am in hearty accord with everything the Senator from Wisconsin says about this item. I

should like to be able to further and support it, but the rules of the Appropriations Committee are mandatory. The Senator in charge of the bill must raise the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill when that question presents itself. This is clearly legislation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I concede that, Mr. President. My only hope was that in view of the manner in which bills are going through the Senate, and the rapidity with which they are being acted upon, the Senator might feel that he could permit this matter to go to conference, where he could give it further study.

Mr. McCARRAN. If there were any latitude in the rule, I would naturally extend it, because I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, but the rule is mandatory, and I must make the point of order. I make the point of order at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada makes the point of order, which is sustained.

EXHIBIT A

Estimated prevalence of syphilis among men aged 18-37 in the continental United States, by age and race

(Based on blood test reports of registrants under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, received from November 1940 through August 1941 and in October and November 1942.)

Age group	White			Negro			Total		
	Population	Syphilis rate per 1,000	Cases	Population	Syphilis rate per 1,000	Cases	Population	Syphilis rate per 1,000	Cases
18-20	3,157,405	8.5	26,923	363,364	130.2	47,301	3,520,769	21.1	74,224
21-25	5,000,793	10.9	55,391	543,764	183.9	99,990	5,544,557	27.7	155,381
26-30	4,784,396	22.5	107,415	519,070	289.1	150,078	5,303,466	48.6	257,493
31-37	6,107,592	39.1	238,742	640,514	353.3	226,308	6,748,106	68.9	465,050
Total	19,110,186	22.4	428,471	2,066,712	253.4	523,677	21,176,898	45.0	952,148

EXHIBIT B

Reports of State health departments¹ on the status of registrants found with evidence of syphilis under the Selective Service blood-testing program

United States	Total number of registrants found with evidence of syphilis	Estimated distribution of registrants with syphilis, by race		Distribution of registrants with syphilis, by treatment status	
		White	Negro	Under treatment	Not under treatment
Total	524,400	235,300	289,100	279,300	245,100
Percent	100.0	44.9	55.1	53.3	46.7

States	Total number of registrants found with evidence of syphilis	Estimated distribution of registrants with syphilis by race		Distribution of registrants with syphilis by treatment status	
		White	Negro	Under treatment	Not under treatment
Alabama	19,700	4,100	15,600	12,400	7,300
Arizona	1,800	1,400	400	900	900
Arkansas	10,100	2,300	7,800	4,900	5,200
California	25,900	22,300	3,600	10,800	15,100
Colorado	1,700	1,600	100	900	800
Connecticut	2,200	1,500	700	1,100	1,100
Delaware	1,400	800	600	1,100	300
District of Columbia	10,200	1,800	8,400	3,900	6,300
Florida	38,000	9,100	28,900	22,800	15,200
Georgia	20,000	6,000	14,000	13,500	10,500
Idaho	300	300		100	200
Illinois	8,000	5,400	2,600	4,800	3,200
Indiana	10,000	7,500	2,500	3,700	6,300
Iowa	5,000	4,700	300	2,500	2,500
Kansas	4,100	3,000	1,100	900	2,200
Kentucky	10,500	3,700	6,800	6,400	4,100
Louisiana	31,600	7,600	24,000	15,600	16,000
Maine	1,000	1,000		400	600
Maryland	20,000	6,300	13,700	10,000	10,000
Massachusetts	2,800	2,400	400	2,000	800

EXHIBIT B

Reports of State health departments¹ on the status of registrants found with evidence of syphilis under the Selective Service blood-testing program—Continued

States	Total number of registrants found with evidence of syphilis	Estimated distribution of registrants with syphilis by race		Distribution of registrants with syphilis by treatment status	
		White	Negro	Under treatment	Not under treatment
Michigan.....	11,200	7,500	3,700	3,200	8,000
Minnesota.....	1,800	1,800	100	600	1,300
Mississippi.....	25,200	2,900	22,300	20,900	4,300
Missouri.....	10,600	6,800	3,800	5,500	5,100
Montana.....	500	500	—	100	400
Nebraska.....	1,200	1,000	200	800	400
Nevada.....	400	400	—	200	200
New Hampshire.....	500	300	—	200	100
New Jersey.....	10,000	5,500	4,500	5,000	5,000
New Mexico.....	3,000	2,800	200	1,500	1,500
New York.....	12,000	7,400	4,600	7,000	5,000
North Carolina.....	28,000	7,000	21,000	14,000	14,000
North Dakota.....	400	400	—	200	200
Ohio.....	11,600	8,000	3,600	9,300	2,300
Oklahoma.....	8,100	5,400	2,700	4,800	3,300
Oregon.....	1,500	1,500	—	1,000	500
Pennsylvania.....	20,000	13,000	7,000	12,000	8,000
Rhode Island.....	700	600	100	500	200
South Carolina.....	13,900	2,800	11,100	8,600	5,300
South Dakota.....	300	300	—	100	200
Tennessee.....	16,700	6,700	10,000	9,900	6,800
Texas.....	50,000	24,500	25,500	26,000	24,000
Utah.....	200	200	—	100	100
Vermont.....	100	100	(²)	(³)	100
Virginia.....	20,000	5,800	14,200	7,700	12,300
Washington.....	2,000	1,900	100	800	1,200
West Virginia.....	8,000	6,200	1,800	4,000	4,000
Wisconsin.....	2,000	1,800	200	1,400	600
Wyoming.....	300	300	—	100	200
Chicago.....	11,200	7,500	3,700	7,900	3,300
New York City.....	18,800	12,600	6,200	7,500	11,300
Total.....	524,400	235,300	289,100	279,300	245,100

¹ For the period Nov. 1, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1942.² Estimated³ Less than 50.

EXHIBIT C

Funds budgeted and activities reported for venereal-disease control in States and Territories for the fiscal years 1940-43

	1940	1941		1942		1943 ¹		
	Amount or number	Amount or number	Percent increase, 1940-41	Amount or number	Percent increase, 1941-42	Amount or number	Percent increase, 1942-43	Percent increase, 1940-43
I. Funds budgeted for venereal-disease control.....	\$10,645,183.20	\$13,153,498.76	23.6	\$15,432,508.77	17.3	\$18,052,980.00	17.0	69.6
A. Federal.....	4,656,528.20	6,362,218.76	36.6	8,447,924.25	32.8	10,595,880.00	25.4	127.5
B. State and local.....	5,988,656.00	6,791,280.00	13.4	6,984,584.52	2.8	7,457,100.00	6.8	24.5
II. Venereal-disease control activities:								
A. Syphilis:								
1. Cases reported to State health departments.....	487,464	494,813	1.5	489,172	—1.1	590,604	20.7	21.2
2. Admissions to clinic service.....	288,778	340,615	18.0	343,312	.8	430,302	25.3	49.0
3. Average monthly patient load in clinics.....	290,982	384,478	32.1	400,198	4.1	445,702	11.4	53.2
4. Treatments administered in clinics.....	8,313,796	10,661,259	28.2	10,682,137	.2	12,506,784	17.1	50.4
(a) Arsenicals (doses).....	3,719,880	4,885,736	—	4,928,484	—	5,891,090	19.5	58.4
(b) Heavy metals (doses).....	4,593,916	5,775,523	—	5,753,653	—	6,615,694	15.0	44.0
5. Arsenical drugs (doses) distributed by State health departments.....	6,895,837	8,161,491	18.4	8,727,964	6.9	10,813,934	23.9	56.8
6. Serologic tests in laboratories.....	10,216,978	16,520,591	61.7	20,173,769	22.1	30,895,328	53.1	202.4
B. Gonorrhea:								
1. Cases reported to State health departments.....	180,383	198,432	10.0	220,432	11.1	282,815	28.3	56.8
2. Admissions to clinic service.....	66,811	84,418	26.4	104,421	23.7	133,784	28.1	100.2
3. Average monthly patient load in clinics.....	30,392	26,487	—12.8	25,536	—3.6	33,153	29.8	9.1
4. Treatment visits in clinics.....	851,694	712,164	—16.4	801,267	12.5	764,315	—4.6	—10.3
5. Sulfanilamide drugs (tablets) distributed by State health departments.....	5,179,586	7,218,617	37.3	13,836,985	91.7	23,102,238	67.0	346.0
6. Tests (for detection of gonococcus) in laboratories.....	1,038,086	1,224,227	17.9	1,369,663	11.9	1,559,408	13.9	44.8
C. General:								
1. Publications distributed by State health departments.....	3,324,358	4,158,008	25.1	4,342,633	4.4	2,710,299	—37.6	—18.5
2. Clinics treating venereal disease.....	2,454	3,245	32.2	3,569	10.0	3,704	3.8	50.9

¹ Estimate based on first 6 months of fiscal year.² Percent decrease.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be very glad to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that in view of the importance of the decision on the National Youth Adminis-

tration amendment, and the fact that it was decided by four votes, if there is anything I can do to have the bill go over until tomorrow or next day, until the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] may be present. I think I am justified in doing so. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that it is my intention to suggest the absence of a

quorum every time I have the right to do so under the rules, and to make a motion to reconsider.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to submit a conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. The conference report will involve a record vote before we conclude.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 97, 122, and 123.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "herein" where it occurs in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the words "in this act"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,128,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,349,063"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

In the first paragraph of said amendment in the proviso thereof, and after the word "projects" where the same first occurs in such proviso, insert the words "under his supervision."

At the end of the first paragraph of said amendment, following the word "funds" and before the period, insert the following: "Provided further, That during the first four months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration may, in his discretion, authorize expenditures from this appropriation at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of the total appropriation during each of such months."

In the third paragraph of said amendment after the word "elsewhere", and before the comma, insert the following: "at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made."

In the third paragraph of said amendment before the word "Provided" strike out the colon and insert a period, and strike out all of the proviso down to and including the word "made."

In the fourth paragraph of said amendment after the word "necessary" insert the following: ", in the discretion of the Administrator."

At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' shall be available to pay the

compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the third paragraph of said amendment, in the first proviso thereof, after the word "tenancy" and before the semicolon, insert the following: ", or an amount sufficient to make not more than five loans in any one State or Territory, whichever amount is the larger"; and the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 87, 88, 92, 98, and 99.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. McNARY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARTER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is this report?

Mr. RUSSELL. This is a partial conference report on the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture. The conference report which has been submitted is not complete. It deals with many provisions of the bill, but there are a couple of matters still in disagreement. For the information of the Senate, probably I should state that the conference report which has been submitted disposes of the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. The items in disagreement relate to the soil-conservation payments and to the program of crop insurance.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How does the conference report dispose of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate conferees very reluctantly accepted the House provision, with minor amendments as to restrictions on the use of the appropriation.

The Senator from Missouri is aware of the fact that when the bill reached the floor of the House a substitute for the Senate amendment was offered, which retained the substance of the Senate amendment and the amount of appropriation of the Senate amendment for the tenant purchase program, but which drastically reduced the appropriation for rural-rehabilitation loans and grants and administration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the net result?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am coming to that. The report carries the same amount of

appropriation for the tenant-purchase loans as was contained in the Senate amendment, which was \$30,000,000. The appropriation for administrative expenses, \$1,326,070, was also agreed to.

There was a change made, in that an appropriation was made to the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution rather than to the Secretary of Agriculture, as has been the case heretofore.

In connection with the appropriation for rural-rehabilitation loans, the Senate provision carried an appropriation of \$97,500,000. The conferees adopted the House provision of \$60,000,000 for such loans.

The Senate amendment appropriated \$29,607,573 for administration for the coming year. The House appropriated \$20,000,000. The conferees agreed to the \$20,000,000, with language which will permit, for the first 4 months of the fiscal year 1944, the expenditure at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of the total appropriation during each of such months. That language was inserted in the bill because of the fact that at the present time the House Standing Committee on Agriculture has under consideration the whole matter of legislation affecting the Farm Security Administration. We were advised that a bill will be reported at an early date which will clearly define the activities of the Farm Security Administration and its authority, as well as make authorization for appropriations, something that should have been done some time ago.

That is practically the only matter of any importance that is in the conference report now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have no disposition to delay action on the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill, but in view of my expressed desire that House bill 2935 be not acted upon tonight, I feel it is incumbent upon me to suggest the absence of a quorum preceding the motion of the Senator from Georgia. In other words, Mr. President, I think the vote on the National Youth Administration amendment is close enough to entitle us to have a vote of the full Senate. I propose to exercise every parliamentary right which I can think of to prevent a final vote being had on the bill tonight.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in view of what has transpired, it seems to me that perhaps time would be saved by allowing the vote on House bill 2935 to go over until tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. House bill 2935?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the bill pending before the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 2935, the unfinished business, go over until the reconvening of the Senate tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Did not the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] move that the conference report be agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Pending that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are three or four conference reports awaiting action by the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that I have no disposition to interfere with any of them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. In addition, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] desires to bring up a bill which will probably not create any opposition. He wishes to have it acted upon by the Senate before an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate. So I think that no time would be lost if the pending bill should go over until tomorrow, and we may gain some time by proceeding on other matters that are ready for disposition.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Chair state the present parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has made the unanimous-consent request that the pending bill (H. R. 2935) be postponed until tomorrow. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now recurs on agreeing to the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, certain amendments are still in disagreement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask whether the Farm Security Administration was involved in the report?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered, so that I may make a brief statement. I should like to have the statement come before the agreement on the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I realize that in the present temper of the Senate there is no possibility of upsetting the conference report, but I wish to state for the record that I think the amendments which the conference committee has agreed to are crippling in character. So far as I am personally concerned, I should prefer to see the Farm Security Administration killed and

given a decent burial, rather than have it strangled over a period of time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the conference report be agreed to.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are certain amendments which are in disagreement at the present time. I desire to have them considered and to have action taken on them.

Mr. President, there are still in disagreement amendments numbered 87, 88, 92, 98, and 99. Amendments numbered 87, 88, and 92 all relate to the so-called soil-conservation and domestic allotment appropriation. We are in an anomalous position with respect to the appropriation. The Senate by a record vote, as I recall, of approximately 53 to 25, allowed the full amount of the Budget estimate of \$400,000,000. The conferees could not agree on the item when they met, and the House sent the amendment back for a second vote. Incidental to the appropriation of \$400,000,000 there was in the bill certain language which provided that funds could be expended in the manner provided and for the purposes announced last December by the Secretary of Agriculture. Senators will recall that in the debate on the bill the position of the committee was that this was an obligation to the farmers for payments to be made in accordance with the terms of the announcement on last December 5. When the bill reached the House, the House by a record vote adopted the provision for the full \$400,000,000 by a majority of about 11. However, when the language of the bill providing for the expenditure of funds in accordance with the announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture was read in the House there were about 20 less votes on the second vote than on the first, and the Senate amendment providing for the expenditure of the funds for which the House had agreed to appropriate was defeated by a slight margin in the House, throwing around the appropriation the restrictions which the House threw about them in the first instance, which would prevent compliance with these contracts. I think the Senate should have a record vote. It is the integral part of the amendment which the Senate approved by a vote of 53 to 25.

The whole point at issue was whether or not the Congress would keep faith with the farmers who had made out their work sheets in December of last year. Both Houses have appropriated the money. The Senate authorized the payments, but the House, by a small vote, did not adopt the Senate amendment authorizing the payments.

Certainly we should not leave the matter in that position. I therefore move that the Senate insist upon its language to complete this whole transaction, as found in amendment numbered 87 of the bill as it passed the Senate. I hope the Senate will give us a record vote on this question. I think perhaps if that is done, the matter might possibly be settled. I

ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. What is the question?

Mr. RUSSELL. That the Senate insist on its amendment with regard to the Senate appropriation.

Mr. TAFT. The \$400,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it is the language which authorizes the payments. The \$400,000,000 has been approved by the House, but the House has not receded from its language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Chavez	Hawkes
Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Hayden
Ball	Danaher	Hill
Bankhead	Davis	Holman
Barkley	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Bilbo	George	Kilgore
Bridges	Gerry	La Follette
Butler	Green	Langer
Capper	Guffey	Lucas
Caraway	Gurney	McCarran
Chandler	Hatch	McClellan

McFarland	Overton	Thomas, Utah
McKellar	Pepper	Truman
McNary	Radcliffe	Tunnell
Maloney	Reed	Vandenberg
Maybank	Revercomb	Van Nuys
Mead	Robertson	Wagner
Millikin	Russell	Wallgren
Murdock	Scrugham	Wheeler
Murray	Shipstead	Wherry
Nye	Stewart	White
O'Daniel	Taft	Willis
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson

NAYS—2

Ferguson

Lodge

NOT VOTING—25

Austin	Byrd	Reynolds
Bailey	Clark, Idaho	Smith
Barbour	Connally	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Downey	Tobey
Brewster	Ellender	Tydings
Brooks	Gillette	Walsh
Buck	Glass	Wiley
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	
Bushfield	Moore	

So the Senate insisted on its amendment numbered 87.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments numbered 88 and 92. They are amendments dealing with the soil-conservation program. I expect that from the vote the Senate just took it would necessarily follow that the whole item should be left in disagreement, even though the vote just taken is that which controls the expenditure of \$400,000,000, which the Senate approved.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator tell us what the difference is in the language, or what we are voting on?

Mr. RUSSELL. I undertook to explain the amendment, but perhaps due to the lateness of the hour I did not go into as much detail as I should have done.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know what clarification is brought about by the language. What does the Senator want done?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was moving that the Senate insist upon its amendments and adhere to the position taken heretofore. I think it might be well to have the clerk report the two amendments, numbered 88 and 92. The amendments have to do with the formulation of the program for 1944. Both the House language and the Senate language limit next year's program to \$300,000,000, but there is a difference in the way the program is to be set up under the two provisions. The House language confines the program strictly to a soil- and water-conservation program. In other words, no payment could be made except for building a terrace, planting a tree, or pursuing some other recognized and accepted soil-conservation program.

The Senate amendment likewise limited the appropriation for next year to \$300,000,000, which, as Senators know, is a reduction of \$200,000,000 below the amount made available for years. The Senate amendment does give the Department of Agriculture discretion in establishing the program for the expenditure of the funds. There is no difference in the amount of the money that can be expended, but the House language ties it strictly to a soil conserving program, whereas the Senate language would give the department some leeway in announcing the program, whereby it might

encourage the production of crops of some commodities especially needed, and would not confine the payments to strictly soil conservation practices.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps some of that money might be used for incentive and subsidy payments.

Mr. RUSSELL. It all depends on what are called incentive payments.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am asking about.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not attempt to describe an incentive payment. One of the motions I shall make in a moment is based on the fact that the House language specifically prohibits any incentive payments. I have never seen any legal definition of an incentive payment to a farmer. In my judgment, a soil-conservation payment is an incentive payment, and if such general language is placed in the bill, it would likely destroy the entire soil-conservation program. One of the amendments I shall move that the Senate insist upon, is an amendment which strikes out the language in the House bill:

That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments.

That language was put in on the floor of the House. I do not know what it means. I do not believe any other person could predict with any degree of certainty as to how a court would construe that language, or how the Comptroller General might construe it, because, as I stated a moment ago, any payment that was made to a farmer, whether made in lime, or in nitrates, or in trees, is in the nature of an incentive payment to distribute that lime or to plant those trees. Of course, I do not think there is any question but that the House had in mind trying to prevent the incentive payments which were requested by the President in a special budget estimate asking for \$100,000,000 for making what the Department of Agriculture or the Bureau of the Budget designated as incentive payments. That money is not appropriated in the bill.

I am perfectly willing to accept language, if the House sees fit to offer it, or to agree to it, which would provide that no incentive payments, as defined in the message of the President some time in February, which is House Document 101, shall be made from these funds. If it is proposed to say that no incentive payments should be made, there is grave doubt in my mind, and I think in the Senator's mind, that even a soil-conservation payment could be made, because such payments are all in the nature of incentive payments. I think we should be careful to define what payments we are making.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand correctly that all the Senator from Georgia is asking the Senate to do now is to approve what the Senate has heretofore done?

Mr. RUSSELL. All I am asking is that the Senate insist upon the position the Senate previously took when it voted this language out on the floor of the Senate a few days ago.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senate has already passed on the question, and the Senator from Georgia insists that the language remain just as the Senate adopted it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am asking the Senate that it adhere to its former action taken when this question was before the Senate previously.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The House amendment provides ironclad language, whereas the Senate amendment would leave some discretionary powers as to the possibility of soil conservation, rotation of crops, and such measures as would aid in the war effort?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. What the Senator from Georgia proposes does not specifically create an incentive, but the Department of Agriculture can determine what is conservation under this language.

Mr. RUSSELL. Within the terms of legislation the Congress has enacted, the Department could not bring in any new practice, but it could operate under the existing law. The effect of the House limitation is to repeal all provisions of the act not related directly to soil-conservation practices. We are merely saying that the Secretary may operate under the statute enacted by the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is one other amendment, although two are really involved, and that is relating to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Senators will recall that the action of the House on the bill had the effect of repealing the Crop Insurance Act. The House language provided that no part of the appropriation should be used except in connection with the liquidation of outstanding contracts of crop insurance. The House has voted on this proposition a second time since the first conference, and by a record vote has adhered to its former position, which seeks to liquidate and annul the Crop Insurance Act. It is up to the Senate to decide what it wants to do with respect to crop insurance in the future. I have given the facts in the case as best I know them.

This program has been in effect for 4 years as applied to wheat, and 1 year as applied to cotton. During that period there have been losses aggregating approximately \$17,000,000 of the capital structure of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. About sixteen and one-quarter million dollars of that loss was incurred with respect to wheat, and something like five or six hundred thousand dollars with respect to cotton.

Though I am not particularly wedded to crop insurance, I think it is entitled to a fair trial. In my opinion, a splendid case was made through days of hearings before the subcommittee that would justify a continuation of this program in an effort to arrive at a basis of operations under which the Government will not suffer any loss, and the farmers will have protection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with the Senator from Georgia. I was not particularly wedded to this particular policy in the first place, but does not the Senator think that taking it by and large, it is about as beneficial money as the Government has spent in connection with agriculture over a period of years? I believe it is, at least since I have been in the Senate and the Senator from Georgia has been chairman of the great subcommittee dealing with agriculture in the Appropriations Committee. Does not the Senator think that has been a really beneficial appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated when the measure was debated on the floor in the first instance, that in my judgment without crop insurance it would have been necessary to make out of the Treasury relief appropriations which would at least have aggregated the amount of the losses of this Corporation. If a great disaster should ever occur in an agricultural section the Congress will see to it that those farmers do not suffer. If the farmers are aided through insurance the cost will be prorated among farmers all over the country. In my opinion over a long period of years the crop-insurance program will save money to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator again yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Georgia that at the present time I have a bill pending in the Appropriations Committee which I intend to offer as an amendment to another bill proposed by the Senator from Illinois and reported from the Committee on Commerce, to make an appropriation of \$15,000,000 for direct relief for damage directly suffered this year as the result of floods in the Missouri Valley, the Mississippi Valley, and the Ohio Valley. I think that is an extremely moderate estimate. If that whole amount had been covered into the crop insurance which the Senator is discussing, such a direct appropriation would not be necessary.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in the assumption that over a protracted period of time all the Federal Government does is to pay the overhead of operating the crop insurance programs, and that the cost of the programs is distributed among the owners of the crops insured?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the way we hope to have the program operate. Of course, there have been some capital losses up to now. We hope to get the program operating in the way the Sen-

ator from Florida has stated. Of course when we established this corporation we created a capital of \$100,000,000. So we anticipated there would be some loss. But I wish to point out that in the hearings before the committee it developed that without exception all the old line companies, all the mutual companies, have experienced losses in the first 4 or 5 years of their operation.

Today we have had the experience of 4 years of operation with wheat and 1 year of operation with cotton. We have changed the system of insurance. For the first 3 years we had a 1-year policy; and, of course, in an area where there had been a great deal of rain and snow and where the season was not unfavorable, the farmer would not insure his crop; but where the prospects were a little gloomy, the farmer would insure his wheat crop. It was interesting how it was possible to spot the crop failures around the country by following the number of insurance policies issued in those sections.

Now a 3-year period has been adopted. Only a 3-year policy is sold. That requires the extension of the risk over 3 years. In my opinion the losses which have been incurred are the principal losses we shall sustain under the program, and in a short time it will be absolutely self-sustaining.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with what the Senator has said with reference to the benefits of crop insurance. So far as the wheat areas in my State are concerned, where drought and hail have occurred, crop insurance has been exceedingly beneficial. If it had not been for crop insurance, in some years some of the farmers who raised wheat in the drought areas would have had to apply to the Federal Government for direct appropriations to be used for feeding them.

The program has been of great benefit, and all the farmers in my State, without exception, take the position that the program is one upon which they all agree, and they consider it to be most beneficial. I certainly hope provision for it will be retained in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are profiting by experience. The losses have been reduced, and the number of insurers has been increasing. Of course, Senators are aware of the fact that no farmer can put 100-percent insurance on his crop. The amount of insurance is limited to 75 percent of the farmer's crop, is based on his 5-year average, and is under the supervision of the local committees of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. I do not think we should abandon the program at the present juncture.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina and then to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I expected to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia a question which he has now explained. The answer is this: With the 3-year insurance policy program and with the many safeguards the

Department of Agriculture, through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, has thrown around crop insurance, crop insurance is good business not only for the farmers, but for all the American people. I only wish that a law providing for such a program had been in effect many years ago; and I certainly hope the present program will be maintained.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield now to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to add a few very brief remarks to what the Senator from Georgia has said. I do not want to detain the Senate, but I desire to call the Senate's attention to the difference between a crop insurance program and most of the other programs we have been talking about, all of which, except the crop insurance program, are to some extent taking on the nature of a subsidy program or a charity program.

What those of us who have lived with the crop-insurance program for several years are trying to do is to put the farmer on his feet, if we can do so, by means of a system of crop insurance for which the farmer, not the Government, pays. We have had 4 years' experience. That is not sufficient. In my opinion, it will be necessary to carry forward the crop-insurance program on wheat for at least 3 years more before we can acquire sufficient experience in order to determine whether the program should be made permanent. I hope it will be made permanent.

Let me call attention to the fact that for the first 3 years of operation, 165,000 contracts were made with wheat farmers. In the next year, 360,000 contracts were made. In 1943, 371,000 contracts were made with wheat farmers. Today, approximately 25 percent of the entire wheat crop is growing under the crop-insurance program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask the Senator what crops are insurable.

Mr. REED. The law passed in 1938 provided for crop insurance on wheat alone. The wheat crop insurance program has been operated in 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1943. Two years ago, I think, cotton was added. We have had 1 year's experience with cotton.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Government lost every year on the insurance?

Mr. REED. The Government has lost every year on wheat-crop insurance, for reasons which I now shall point out: The original law restricted wheat-crop insurance to a term of 1 year, which was the worst mistake which could have been made. The need for crop insurance applies principally in the Hard Wheat Belt, the areas where both winter wheat and spring wheat are raised, in the States of Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, North Dakota, Montana, and Oklahoma. In my section of the country, when a farmer sows his wheat along about September, in the fall, if he finds the soil thoroughly devoid of moisture, under the 1-year program he insures his crop. If there is ample moisture in the soil the

chances are that the farmer will get a crop, so he does not insure his crop. So, one of the lessons we learned was to make a 3-year term contract.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why did it take 5 years to find that out?

Mr. REED. The statute required administration on the basis of a 1-year contract. That was the law as the bill passed this body. But we are learning as we go along as best we can.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask another question. How long does the Senator think it will be until the Government finds out what should be the premium, so that at least it will come out nearly even?

Mr. REED. Let me inform the Senator from Michigan that the premium is determined on the basis of the experience on the particular farm on which the crop is insured. There is no fixed premium. The premium varies with the degree of risk assumed, and properly so.

Another point is that originally in the administration of the crop insurance law the corporation took wheat in payment of the premium. It spent approximately \$1,800,000 in paying storage charges on wheat. The corporation has gotten away from that. It now takes a note from the farmer whose crop is insured. The note is payable at harvest time. At harvest time the farmer can pay the note in wheat, if he desires to do so, or in money, if he desires to do that. If the note is paid in wheat, the wheat is immediately cashed on the market, so as to avoid incurring any storage charges.

In other words, in 3 years of experience several important blunders have been discovered.

I desire to say for the wheat crop insurance program—and then I shall conclude—that in the administration of the program the expenses have been kept down to a point lower than the expenses of the large insurance companies themselves. Of the money spent in the first year, a sum equal to 41 percent of the premiums paid was incurred in expenses. The next year, the sum was only 26 percent. In 1941, it was only 21 percent. The large insurance companies incur greater expenses than that.

So, Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate to make a distinction, to use discrimination, to recognize the fact that the program is no subsidy, no charity. We are not asking for a subsidy or a charity. One of the great risks the farmer always incurs is the risk of a crop failure. If we can work out, as I hope we can, a valid, sound, solvent system of crop insurance, we shall have done the farmer more good than will be done for him by many of the programs which are more in the nature of charity.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator tell me what provision is made to cover the losses of the 75 percent of the wheat which is not insured?

Mr. REED. Crop insurance will not be made to cover more than 75 percent

of the average crop on any particular farm.

The farmer himself carries the risk upon the other 25 percent.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Can the Senator tell me whether or not the Government may pay losses in wheat or in dollars, at its option?

Mr. REED. I think the losses are paid in dollars. Originally they were paid in wheat. If the premiums were paid in wheat, the losses were paid in wheat. My impression is that the losses may be paid either way.

Mr. DANAHER. It has reached the point where we are now making up a loss of \$17,000,000 in capital.

Mr. REED. Seventeen million dollars is the aggregate of 3 years' losses, not 1 year's losses.

Mr. DANAHER. But it is in dollars and not in wheat.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Can the Senator tell me what percentage of the farmers make use of the insurance?

Mr. REED. There is no way that I can tell exactly. We started with 10 percent of the wheat crop under insurance. We now have 25 percent of the wheat crop under insurance. As I stated awhile ago, the number of contracts with individual farmers started with 165,000. In 1940 it was 360,000; in 1941 it was 317,000; and my impression is that the present number of contracts exceeds 450,000.

Mr. BUTLER. If it is not in the nature of a subsidy, then why do not insurance companies take the business?

Mr. REED. So wise and successful a businessman as the Senator from Nebraska ought not to ask such a foolish question. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments numbered 98 and 99.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from

Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent, as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canadian branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—51

Alben	Kilgore	Overton
Ball	La Follette	Pepper
Bankhead	Langer	Radcliffe
Barkley	Lucas	Reed
Capper	McCarran	Russell
Caraway	McClellan	Scruggs
Chandler	McFarland	Shipstead
Chavez	McKellar	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Taft
Danaher	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Maybank	Tunnell
Green	Mead	Vandenberg
Gurney	Millikin	Wagner
Hatch	Murdock	Wallgren
Hill	Murray	Wheeler
Holman	Nye	White
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Willis

NAYS—10

Bridges	Gerry	Robertson
Butler	Hawkes	Wherry
Byrd	Lodge	
Ferguson	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—35

Andrews	Connally	Reynolds
Austin	Davis	Smith
Bailey	Downey	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Ellender	Thomas, Utah
Bilbo	George	Tobey
Bone	Gillette	Truman
Brewster	Glass	Tydings
Brooks	Guffey	Van Nuys
Buck	Hayden	Walsh
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Wiley
Bushfield	Moore	Wilson
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	

So Mr. RUSSELL's motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate request a further conference with the House on the amendments still in

disagreement, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. McNARY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, having agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 14, 15, 17, 22, 40, and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, and 69; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$95,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30,676"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$122,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,840,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$977,107"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$237,610"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$145,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$261,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, and after the comma, strike out the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$244,360"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 25, 27, 32, 45, 57, 59, 68, 70, and 72.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
JOHN M. COFFEE,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
KARL STEFAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2513, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
June 28, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 25, 27, 45, 57, 59, 68, and 70 to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "Columbia" insert ": Provided further, That the appropriations and authority contained in this act shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority: And provided further, That all obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$755,780"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lines 7 and 8 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "to continue available until expended."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 4, 32, and 72.

The motion was agreed to.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. HATCH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WALLGREN, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho conferees on the part of the Senate.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE, GARRISON, N. DAK.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 650) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932, which were on page 1, line 4, to strike out "an Act" and insert "Acts"; on page 1, line 5, after "1936", to insert "March 24, 1937"; on page 2, line 4, to strike out "one year" and insert "two years"; and on page 2, line 5, to strike out "three" and insert "four."

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

THADDEUS C. KNIGHT—VETO MESSAGE
(S. DOC. NO. 86)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 414, a bill for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight.

It is the purpose of the bill to authorize the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the said Thaddeus C. Knight, a captain in the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, with the same longevity and rank on both the relative and promotion lists as he would have attained had he not been separated from the service.

In view of the approved findings and sentence of a court of competent jurisdiction in the case of this former officer, I do not feel justified in approving, and thereby establishing an undesirable precedent, special legislation, the effect of which would be to set aside the judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction by legislative action.

I am, however, directing the Secretary of War to appoint a board of officers to

investigate Mr. Knight's entire record and his present qualifications for appointment as an officer and shall take such action with reference to a new appointment as the facts may warrant.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 28, 1943.

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1134, to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941. I have consulted with the majority and minority leaders, and it is satisfactory to them that I make the request.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very sorry that I must object to the present consideration of the bill. I wish to investigate it further. I notice that in one place it makes provision for a loan to the railroads of \$100,000,000 without interest. Farmers, as well as merchants, and small businessmen are paying high rates of interest. For that reason I object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a certified copy of an agreement, executed by the Governors of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kentucky, to extend for 4 years, commencing September 1, 1943, the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas.

The original of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, in accordance with a provision contained therein, has been deposited in the archives of the State Department.

The compact between the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas was first executed in February 1935, and received the consent of the Congress in August 1935. Since that time the compact, with the consent of the Congress, three times has been extended and renewed for 2-year periods, the last extension period expiring September 1, 1943.

The compact designed to promote State legislation relating to the conservation of petroleum and gas also has resulted in an effective collaboration of the oil-producing States which are parties thereto upon oil problems of general import. In view of the worthy purposes of the compact, it is particularly heartening to note that the compact, first ratified by 6 States, has been ratified by 12 of the States.

I suggest that the Congress, by appropriate legislation, sanction this extension

agreement as required by article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 28, 1943.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if any other Senator wishes to bring any matter before the Senate at this time I shall yield to him. If not, I now ask for recognition in order to submit a conference report. Half a dozen times this afternoon I asked for recognition, and each time the Vice President looked at me and recognized some other Senator. Therefore, if no Senator desires to bring up any other matter at this time, and if the Vice President will deign to recognize me, I shall be very glad to have him do so in order that I may lay before the Senate a conference report. Am I recognized, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is now recognized, and may always be recognized any time he desires recognition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Vice President. It is a very great condescension on his part.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment Numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit all of the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment and omit all of the matter proposed to be inserted in lieu thereof by action of the Senate and House of Representatives; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morris Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States

nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 61.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, at the proper time I desire to make a point of order against the conference report. I do not necessarily wish to do so tonight if the Senator from Tennessee does not desire to pursue the matter tonight. I shall be glad to have it go over as the unfinished business, and I will make my point of order against the conference report at the earliest opportunity tomorrow. However, if the Senator from Tennessee wishes to continue tonight, I shall be glad to make the point of order now.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it will be recalled that a conference report was made a few days ago and rejected by the Senate. Today it comes in a different form. I believe that every Senator knows what it is. Several hundred thousand employees are without pay, which is being held up by reason of the fact that three employees of the Government are accused of subversive activities.

I believe that every Senator knows something about the subject, and knows how he will vote upon the report. I should like to see the Government employees who are entitled to their salaries receive them. The bill carries an appropriation of approximately \$143,000,000 to pay the salaries of employees of the Government. I should like to see the conference report voted upon this afternoon, because we may have to hold several more conferences with regard to the matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I desire to make the point of order and argue it at some length, at least so far as the Chair will indulge me. Failing in that, I shall desire to argue the merits of the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to consideration of the report being postponed.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a privileged matter, and will remain the unfinished business, inasmuch as it is before the Senate, and I think we might therefore suspend at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no Executive Calendar, so it is not necessary to hold an executive session.

I therefore move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 29, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years from August 27, 1943 (reappointment).

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Ellen S. Woodward, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Social Security Board for the term expiring August 13, 1949 (reappointment).

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Charles M. Hay, from the State of Missouri, to be general counsel in the office of the Executive Director, at \$8,000 per annum, in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Elmer K. Delp, from the State of New York (previously confirmed for the position of senior training supervisor, at \$4,600 per annum), to be assistant regional chief of training, at \$5,600 per annum, in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Chaplain Harold E. Mayo, senior chaplain, United States naval air station, Patuxent River, Md., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we thank Thee for the gift of life. We rejoice that each day brings to us opportunities for service and challenges us to use our talents for the good of our fellow men. In this time of world-wide chaos and war we seek Thy guidance that throughout life we may do Thy will and help mankind. Grant that as a nation and as individuals we may find Thy will and honor Thy name as we live and serve from day to day. Bless those who in places of responsibility and honor represent the sovereign States of this Republic. May they have upon their hearts a sense of destiny and so live and labor that this Nation, under Thee, shall continue as a beacon of inspiration and hope to the freedom-loving peoples of the earth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 25, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communi-

cated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2869. An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 12, 14, 84, 107, and 128 to said bill; that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 126, and 127 to said bill; that the Senate recedes from its amendments numbered 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133 to said bill; that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 19, 87, 88, 92, 97, 98, 99, 116, 120, 121, 122, 123, 126, and 127 to said bill, agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. McNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the Act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of War.
5. Civil Service Commission.
6. Federal Power Commission.
7. Federal Security Agency.
8. United States Maritime Commission.

EXTENSION OF ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE PRESIDENT TO REQUISITION PROPERTY REQUIRED FOR THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 217) to amend an act

entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Kentucky be good enough to tell us briefly the purpose of the bill and the fact that the Secretary of War has requested this extension for 1 year?

Mr. MAY. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the bill that authorized the President to requisition personal property for war purposes. It expires on the 30th day of this month if not extended. The only thing the pending bill (S. 217) does is to extend it for a period of 1 year by striking out the date "June 30, 1943," and inserting the date "June 30, 1944." Otherwise it continues every provision of the original act in effect for that length of time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), is amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1943," and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1944," so that it will read as follows: "That whenever the President, during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, but not later than June 30, 1944, determines that (1) the use of any military or naval equipment, supplies, or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or materials necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation of such equipment, supplies, or munitions is needed for the defense of the United States; (2) such need is immediate and impending and such as will not admit of delay or resort to any other source of supply; and (3) all other means of obtaining the use of such property for the defense of the United States upon fair and reasonable terms have been exhausted, he is authorized to requisition such property for the defense of the United States upon the payment of fair and just compensation for such property to be determined as hereinafter provided, and to dispose of such property in such manner as he may determine is necessary for the defense of the United States."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the act of October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), is amended by striking out the date "December 31, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "December 31, 1944," so that it will read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Whenever the President determines that property acquired under this act and retained is no longer needed for the defense of the United States he shall, if the original owner desires the property and pays the fair value thereof, return such property to the owner; but, in any event, property so acquired and retained shall, if the owner desires the property and pays the fair value thereof, be returned to the owner not later than December 31, 1944."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO INDIAN WAR VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 85) to amend the act of March 5, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898 and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill and give the estimated cost?

PURPOSES OF THE LEGISLATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the general purposes of the legislation is to liberalize the now-existing benefits payable to veterans and dependents of veterans of the Indian wars. This bill provides the same rates for Indian war veterans as are now being received by Spanish War veterans. The rates as to the widows correspond with those of the widows of Union veterans who served during the War between the States. However, before a widow can receive benefits under the provisions of this act, she must be at least 60 years of age and have lived with the veteran for 10 years or more. It must be borne in mind that before anyone can benefit under this proposed Indian war legislation, the veteran must have served at least 30 days in the zone of or in connection with active Indian hostilities. The authority to determine what constitutes the zone of active Indian hostilities under the provisions of this bill is delegated to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Under existing laws this determination is made by the War Department. It is the consensus of opinion of the Indian war veterans and those interested in legislation for them that the War Department has been too rigid in its interpretation of what constitutes a zone of active Indian hostilities. The number who would benefit under the liberalized provisions of this bill both as to veterans and dependents of veterans is negligible.

COST OF THE LEGISLATION

The total cost of the bill would approximate \$671,400 the first year. A break-down by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as to the estimated cost can be found near the close of the Administrator's report on page 6 of the committee report. The average age of the Indian war veterans is 82 years and approximately 1,340 veterans would receive increases at an additional cost of \$284,000 for the first year. Section 3 would make eligible approximately 400 widows for pension, and it has been determined by the Veterans' Administration that only about one-half of those entitled would file during the first year, and the cost for this group would be approximately \$90,000 for the first year. Under section 3 increases for approximately 2,465 widows are provided at an estimated cost for the first year of approximately \$297,400. Summing up this break-down as to cost—and repeating—the total estimated cost for the first year is approximately \$671,400.

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENT

The amendment on page 3, line 15 of the bill reduces the figures from \$150 to \$50. This was an error in printing and is fully explained on page 1 of the committee report.

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

This bill, as amended, is identical with the Indian war bills of the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses—both of which were passed by the House without amendment or dissenting vote. The Seventy-seventh Congress bill, H. R. 1095, was favorably reported by the Committee on Pensions of the United States Senate, but failed to pass the Senate before the adjournment of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

CONCLUSION

This bill has received the commendation of and has been strongly endorsed by the several Indian war veterans' organizations, as well as individual Indian war veterans and dependents of deceased Indian war veterans throughout the country.

It is the opinion of your committee that this proposed legislation is believed to contain necessary liberalizations and simplification of existing law and is considered, from the standpoint of cost as well as other provisions, to be most conservative.

The Indian war veterans will receive the same rates as the Spanish War veterans and their widows will receive the same rates as the Union veterans of the War between the States.

A break-down as to the present rates for the veterans both under present law and under the provisions of this bill may be found in tables of the Administrator's report on pages 4 and 5 of the committee report.

This bill under the provisions of section 7, contains a savings clause which prohibits the reduction, discontinuance, or denial of any rights under any law in effect on the date of enactment of this legislation.

Your committee has held extensive hearings on this subject—both in the Seventy-sixth Congress as well as on May 6 of this Congress—and it is the opinion that this proposed legislation is equitable in character and recommend its passage.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I wish to concur in the statement of my distinguished chairman and to say that after extensive hearings we feel this bill is simply an equalization bill. It was reported by the unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381; 44 Stat. 1361), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That any person who served 30 days or more, or for the duration of one of the campaigns cited in section 1 of the act

of March 4, 1917, even though such campaign was of less than 30 days' duration, in any military organization, whether such person was regularly mustered into the service of the United States or not, but whose service was under the authority or by the approval of the United States or any State or Territory in any Indian war or campaign, or in connection with, or in the zone of, any active Indian hostilities in any of the States or Territories of the United States from January 1, 1817, to December 31, 1898, inclusive, the determination as to what constitutes the zone of active Indian hostilities to be made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and who is now or may hereafter be suffering from any mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character which so incapacitate him for the performance of manual labor as to render him unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact, according to such rules and regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may provide, be placed upon the pension roll of the United States and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$60 a month and not less than \$20 a month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support, and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered and the aggregate of the disabilities shown shall be rated, these rates to be fixed as follows: \$20 a month for one-tenth disability, \$25 a month for one-fourth disability, \$35 a month for one-half disability, \$50 a month for three-fourths disability, and \$60 a month for total disability: *Provided*, That any such person who has reached the age of 62 years shall, upon making proof of such fact, be entitled to receive a pension of \$30 a month; and in case such person has reached the age of 65 years, \$60 a month: *Provided further*, That any such person who is now or hereafter may become, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, shall be given a rate of \$100 a month: *And provided further*, That no one while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home, and while the Government of the United States contributes toward defraying the expense incurred in providing such inmate with domiciliary care shall be paid more than \$150 per month under this act."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381; 44 Stat. 1363), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The pension or increased rate of pension herein provided for shall commence from the date of filing application therefor after the date of enactment of this act in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or the date of the inception of the requisite condition as shown by the evidence, whichever is the later: *Provided*, That as to veterans who hereafter apply for and receive pension under the provisions of this act, increased pension by reason of disability requiring the regular aid and attendance of another person shall be effective as of the date of inception of the requisite condition as shown by the evidence, but not earlier than the date of the original application for pension hereunder."

SEC. 3. The act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 381-381d; 44 Stat. 1361-1363), is hereby amended by adding a new section No. 6 to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The dependent unmarried widow of any person who rendered service as described in section 1 of this act, who is barred from receiving pension because her marriage to the veteran occurred subsequent to March 3, 1917, but who is otherwise entitled to pension under section 2 of this act, shall be entitled to pension in her own right and to

the additional pension provided for minor and helpless children in said section 2: *Provided*, That she has attained the age of 60 years, was married to the veteran 10 or more years prior to his death, and lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death, except where there was a separation which was due to or procured by the veteran without the fault of the widow: *Provided further*, That if pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child of the veteran or to a child or children of the veteran under 16 years of age, the widow shall not be entitled to the pension authorized by this section until the pension to the child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and when these conditions are fulfilled and the pension is granted to the widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; except that in the event the amount being paid to such child or children is less than the amount authorized to the widow by this section, then the difference between said amounts shall be paid to the widow: *Provided further*, That any widow otherwise entitled to pension under this act who has attained or who shall hereafter attain the age of 70 years shall be entitled to and paid a pension at the rate of \$40 per month: *Provided further*, That the widow otherwise entitled under this act who was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service in an Indian war or campaign shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$50 per month. Payment of pension or increase of pension at the rates provided in this section shall commence as provided in section 4 of this act. Pension and increase of pension under this section shall not be paid to the widow who has remarried either once or more than once since the death of the veteran, and upon the remarriage of such a widow her pension shall be terminated."

Sec. 4. The act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 381-381d; 44 Stat. 1361-1363), is hereby amended by adding a new section No. 7 to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. Nothing contained in the provisions of this act shall be construed to discontinue, diminish, or reduce any pension heretofore granted, nor to abridge or deny rights under any law in effect on the date of enactment of this act, nor be held to affect or diminish the additional pension to those on the roll designated as the Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll, as provided by the act of April 27, 1916, but any pension or increase of pension herein provided for shall be in addition thereto."

Sec. 5. Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381d; 44 Stat. 1363), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. No agent, attorney, or other person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for preparing or assisting in the preparation of the necessary papers in the application to the Veterans' Administration for benefits under this act. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for such preparation or assistance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 17, strike out "\$150" and insert "\$50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASTE OF WAR FOOD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend what I am about to read to the House to the attention of the distinguished gentleman and learned representative of the butchers of New York [Mr. CELLER]. I want him to read this when he comes in. This appeared on the first page of my home paper, the Corpus Christi Caller, Corpus Christi, Tex., June 23, 1943:

OWNER STEWS AS GOOD STEAKS BURN IN MAZE OF RED TAPE

The steak burned.

And so did the roast, and the liver (without benefit of onions), and the hamburger meat, and the heart.

In fact, the whole cow burned, consumed in red tape.

The cow belonged to Fred Frank who lives at 300 Bartlett Drive here in town and who has a farm out in the country.

The cow sustained a broken back. A veterinarian informed the Frank family that the cow could not recover, that she would have to be killed.

Mrs. Frank—Mr. Frank was out of town at the time—inquired of the County War Board if the meat could be sold. The board representative informed her that she would have to have a butcher's permit and that she could not have one. The representative, Mrs. Frank said, advised her to burn the animal.

That seemed like a terrible waste of meat in these meatless days. Mrs. Frank phoned the representative again and asked if she could give the meat to the employees on the farm. She received an emphatic "no."

The cow was burned.

Regulations of the Agriculture Food Administration permit a person who lives on a farm to butcher a meat animal but forbids a person who owns a farm but who lives in the city to do the same thing, an official of the Federal meat program explained to a Caller reporter. In fact, the regulations prohibit a city dweller who owns a farm to butcher his own animal and put the meat into a cold storage locker for his own use.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one to include in the RECORD two resolutions received from the Montana Association of County Commissioners now meeting in Billings, Mont., and the other to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

MEAT SPOILAGE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to see in a Montana paper, Great Falls Tribune, June 24, 1943, under Helena date line, the following statement that—

More than 20,000 tons of fresh beef is threatening to spoil on railroad sidetracks from eastern Montana to Seattle while Fed-

eral war agencies do nothing to obtain labor for re-icing refrigerator cars, James D. Graham, president of the Montana Federation of Labor, charged today. Movement of the meat, bound for overseas under lend-lease contracts, has been delayed for several weeks due to a traffic jam between Chicago and Seattle, Graham said, and appealed to the War Manpower Commission and the War Labor Board to take immediate action.

At least 1,000 refrigerator cars loaded with dressed beef are strung out on sidetracks along the Milwaukee Railway from Miles City to Spokane, a distance of 750 miles, awaiting shipping orders, the Montana labor leader declared.

Low-paid re-icers are blamed by the State labor chief for not having any labor to re-ice cars.

He blamed the condition on the War Manpower Commission's refusal to raise railroad maintenance-of-way workers' wages above 50 cents an hour, which caused many of these men to leave their jobs and is making it difficult for railroad companies to replace them, and he added that while a State-wide attempt by the United States Employment Service to recruit men for icing the refrigerator cars was being made it has yielded not one man.

No doubt that condition and many more similar conditions throughout the country is one reason why we here in Washington cannot get any meat. It is one thing if our sacrifices are helping to feed our boys in arms, but it is quite another thing, and our sacrifices become meaningless, if they are to no avail.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some tables prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program in order for the day and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the article read by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]. I hope that the article will assist in inducing the very distinguished gentleman to get behind us who are trying to get the bill recently reported out of the House Committee on Agriculture enacted into law, so that we can get the food distribution program in the hands of a single administrator.

Mr. KLEBERG. That was not a letter. That was an article that appeared in a local paper.

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, the people down in my section of the country and in the Southwest generally are not very enthusiastic with two of the recommendations that came out of the recent food conference in Virginia, one that we again plow the land where millions have been expended and to stop wind erosion in reclaiming it from the so-called dust bowl and planting it to peanuts and soybeans and other crops. They also do not seem to be very much in sympathy with the suggestion that comes from the professors over at Cornell and Columbia that there is more nutrition in corn flakes and soybeans than there is in a good juicy beefsteak. It is hard to convince and convert the hardy people of the plains country to this sort of program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a report on the Taylor Grazing Act and to also place in the Appendix of the Record a poem written by one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a brief poem by a deceased soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WHITTEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks on the antistrike bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I spoke and voted for the antistrike bill when it was up for debate and was a member of the conference committee that rewrote it. Had I been present I would, of course, have voted to override the President's veto, although my live pair accomplished the same result.

At the request of the War Department and by appointment of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I was named to represent that committee at the docking in New York Harbor of our

first hospital ship, the *Acadia*, upon its arrival from north Africa. The War Department was represented by the recently appointed Surgeon General, Maj. Gen. Norman Kirk, and other high-ranking officials. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs was represented by Senator CHANDLER, of Kentucky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in two instances, and in one extension to include a letter by myself and in the other an article by General MacArthur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a short editorial that appeared in my local county paper, the Coshocton Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article by Mr. Albert Goss, master of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a resolution unanimously adopted by the California congressional delegation on June 14, 1943, with reference to the policies of the Government toward resident Japanese. I also ask unanimous consent to include representations and recommendations of the California State Senate fact-finding committee on Japanese resettlement, also a resolution on the same subject by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Pajaro Valley, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the last special order heretofore agreed to, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this afternoon, following the last special order heretofore entered, that of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a number of communications from Butte, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an Associated Press notice of the strike committee of 500 that the C. I. O. is sending to Washington to query legislators.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a statement by Harry W. Farr, chairman of the National Live Stock and Meat Board, made at the annual meeting in Chicago, Ill., June 17, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a resolution adopted by the Conference of Midwest Farm Bureaus of the American Farm Bureau Federation at a meeting recently held in Chicago, and further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter I have recently received from Leo V. Horton, one of the representative businessmen of Mount Vernon, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a resolution adopted by the American Legion post of Sigourney, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the committee of conference on the urgent deficiency bill has entered into some sort of an arrangement under which the three subversive individuals will be kept on the Federal pay roll until next December 31. If this is true, I submit that

these individuals will not be any redder next December than they are right now. The mental gymnastics that resulted in this arrangement certainly would be interesting to observe, but we should not retreat now in this battle of Washington, and I submit that if any unanimous-consent request is advanced to effectuate the purpose of this arrangement it should be objected to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from Aloysius A. Konezal, chief clerk, Lucas County, Ohio, War Price and Rationing Board No. 34, concerning the situation in the rationing board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and include an editorial from the World-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some recommendations by livestock producers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an address by General Somervell on Women's Organization in War Work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Ralph Roessler, of Marion, Ind., under date of June 22, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a companion bill to one introduced by a distinguished gentleman from the other side of this building. It deals with political contributions, and places the same restrictions upon manager groups as it does upon labor groups. I am sure that the Members of this House are willing to support legislation which deals with all groups alike.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in two particulars and include excerpts in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the Appendix and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

USE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 18, the W. P. B. announced that recommendations have been made to require newspapers to reduce their use of newsprint by another 5 percent on the 1st of July.

There is not a newspaper publisher in the land who would hesitate at taking his pro rata share of any necessary cut, and even more, if he felt that the Government itself was setting a good example.

But such is not the case. Three thousand two hundred Government publicity agents still flood the country with hand-outs on every conceivable subject under the sun, that end up in newspaper wastebaskets. Most of them serve no useful purpose whatsoever. They only add to the sum total of the country's available supply of waste paper.

In this morning's mail I have a 4-page release accompanied by 10 pictures, size 8 by 10, sent to our newspapers. With the release comes a request that editors using the release send a clip sheet back to the public-relations officer.

The free press of this country has discharged with great credit its responsibility to give the public the news of the day that the public is entitled to hear.

Today, however, they are being choked to death by the flood of Government hand-outs on the one hand, while on the other hand these continued cuts in the supply of newsprint strike out at the jugular vein of our free press.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business for the day and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

THE RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my desire to go home is just as great as that of any other Member. But the people's business must be taken care of first. We have appropriated upward of \$71,000,000,000 for the Army. Then this morning along comes a report in the news-

paper telling us that six of these four-motored transport planes are being refitted, one for the use of Secretary Knox and one for Mr. Patterson, and the others for some officers who desire to get around during the week ends.

My desire to go home is somewhat lessened by the fact that, when we get there, the folks are going to ask us why we did not stay and do something about the use of Army planes for week-end trips by the playboys in the President's Cabinet and for week-end trips by officers. We should stay until this Congress finishes up some of these tasks.

We have appropriated billions upon billions of dollars.

Many of us voted for these vast sums for the Army and for the Navy because we have no way of determining the exact amount either needs. We have been forced to trust those in the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps who speak for their respective branches of the service.

When they use planes built for the Army and the Navy to travel about on week-end trips; when men like Knox go on so-called inspection trips in a 21-passenger transport plane, they betray our confidence.

When our people need gasoline for farming operations; when our people are deprived of gasoline and the reason given is that the armed forces need it, and then when they read in the newspapers that the planes are being used, the gasoline wasted, on pleasure trips or on needless trips by the Secretary of the Navy, by Under Secretary of War Patterson, by high-ranking officials in either branch of the service, they are indignant.

The politicians in the armed forces will catch just what the labor leaders got last week, if they do not watch their step.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] spoke about newsprint a few moments ago. There is something to which I wish to call the attention of the Members of this House. Every one of us receives at our home a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. How many of us read it? About 12 Members read it at their homes. Last year I attempted, on account of the difficulty of sending that out to the residence of each Member, to cut it off. A protest went up. There is a waste of paper on the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would prefer to have the copy that goes to my office cut off if necessary.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Do you get a copy at home?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If you are going to cut out one or the other, I would prefer to have the one at home. I read it at home more than I do at the office.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I do not get a copy at home. I just get a copy at the office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I send my extra copy to good Democrats in my district.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Do you send that one out?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The one that comes to the house I read in the morning and in the afternoon I send it on home.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want to congratulate the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ELEANOR McCLOSKEY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reinstate the bill (H. R. 438) for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas, on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ERRONEOUS PRESS REPORTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in some of the press a statement which I think the people of the country are entitled to have the truth about. It has been known for a long time that the Congress, justifiably so, should take a recess after completing the business that is immediately before us. I noticed in the paper this morning, and I understand some of the commentators on the radio have made the same statement, that, according to the resolution, the Speaker and the Vice President can call us back into session during the recess—and this is a recess and not an adjournment—or the majority leaders or the minority leaders.

Some of the press have construed that as an expression of congressional differences with the President of the United States. I think that is not only unfair, incorrect, unreasonable, but, in my opinion, such an erroneous interpretation should be quickly corrected. I recognize when I use these words that whoever wrote the articles are liable to expend his or their wrath upon me, but there are times, especially in wartimes, when there must be plain speaking. Certain members of the press who will resort to this ought to be men enough to take constructive criticism. If there ever was an interpretation and statement made that is inconsistent with the truth, it is that. The only purpose there can be is to bring about division among our people. I do not know how extensive it has been carried, but the one who wrote that, if he is decent, will now carry the fact that his interpretation is absolutely wrong. It is incorrect. There is no foundation for it. These continuous efforts to divide our people should cease in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LXXXIX—419

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a newspaper article entitled "Once There Was a Carpenter," written by Dr. Montgomery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from a paper in my congressional district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this discussion with reference to the contemplated recess or adjournment of the Congress, its reconvening, and so forth, may I direct the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the two Houses of Congress may convene at any time, organize themselves into a Congress and proceed to the discharge of their legislative duties without being called together by anybody. That is a privilege and power inherent in the constituent elements of the Congress which it is fundamentally necessary that the Congress shall hold to and fully establish if that power is ever challenged. It is not consistent with the duties and the responsibilities of the Representatives of the people that there can be any agency in this Government, not even the Congress itself, which can project its judgment and power into the future so as to prevent a Congress convening and resuming its representative duties when in the judgment of the Members of Houses of Congress such resumption is necessary in the public interest. The constitutional powers of the President to adjourn Congress in the event of the inability of the two Houses to agree and the President's constitutional power to call the Congress back into extra session constitutes no limitation upon the general inherent power of the Congress to resume their constitutional duties when in their judgment such resumption is required in the public interest. This I suggest Mr. Speaker, is a consistent, necessary, inherent power which it is the duty of the Congress to assert, defend, and establish if ever it should be called in question.

AIRPLANES FOR CERTAIN OFFICIALS AND OUR SECRET WEAPON, THE O. W. W.—ONE-WORLD WILLKIE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remark that I am very proud of my two leaders from Massachusetts, and I dislike to see them criticized. On the other hand, I want to express my own happiness—obscure is my safety.

Another thought I wish to express is, Do not waste your CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. We have to send them to libraries and many of the same prominent people each year. I hold out a dozen each day and send them to various people, and I can assure you they seem to be greatly appreciated and bring about a better understanding of the Congress.

There is a grain of comfort I may give to our majority leader. You would not worry so much about what people think about you if you could realize how seldom they did it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a story about the famous ship-builder of New Orleans, Andrew Jackson Higgins.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

SLAUGHTERHOUSES CLOSED

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have just received word that the last slaughterhouse in my territory has closed up. The roll-back in prices and the failure to intelligently operate the subsidy system, if they were going to have a subsidy, has made it impossible for them to continue any longer. There were 15 of these slaughterhouses 6 months ago; today there are none, and it is absolutely impossible around my territory to buy beef. I think this fully justifies the attitude of the House and the Senate in refusing to go along with the subsidy program. We have got to drop it and begin to handle the food situation intelligently or America is going to face starvation.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INTERSTATE PETROLEUM AND GAS COMPACT (H. DOC. NO. 243)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:
—I transmit herewith a certified copy of an agreement, executed by the Governors of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma,

Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kentucky, to extend for 4 years, commencing September 1, 1943, the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas.

The original of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, in accordance with a provision contained therein, has been deposited in the archives of the State Department.

The compact between the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas was first executed in February 1935, and received the consent of the Congress in August 1935. Since that time the compact, with the consent of the Congress, three times has been extended and renewed for 2-year periods, the last extension period expiring September 1, 1943.

The compact designed to promote State legislation relating to the conservation of petroleum and gas also has resulted in an effective collaboration of the oil-producing States which are parties thereto upon oil problems of general import. In view of the worthy purposes of the compact, it is particularly heartening to note that the compact, first ratified by 6 States, has been ratified by 12 of the States.

I suggest that the Congress, by appropriate legislation, sanction this extension agreement as required by article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 28, 1943.

DISTRIBUTION OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House now is to reply to the gentleman from Michigan and some of the Republican Members who are in favor of sending out CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and mailing them to Democrats. They advocate this because they believe that the common people and those who may not be well informed will be prone to believe the misstatements which they make on the floor from day to day and to give credence to the distorted or exaggerated articles that they insert to mislead the people. I feel that many of the statements and erroneous articles should not be printed because they are made by the Republicans for political reasons and to prejudice the people against the administration and the President. But, despite your efforts in that direction, the people will continue to have confidence in President Roosevelt and the Democratic administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following the disposition of other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

SALE OF HORSE MEAT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up S. 832, an act relating to the sale of horse meat of food products thereof in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will that deprive me of the right to offer an amendment to S. 832?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It does not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after 30 days after the date of enactment of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to sell or offer for sale within the District of Columbia to any person any horse meat or food product thereof unless such meat or food product is plainly and conspicuously labeled, marked, branded, or tagged "horse meat" or "horse-meat product," as the case may be, or, in the case of any horse meat or food product thereof which is sold or offered for sale to any consumer at a hotel, restaurant, or similar establishment, unless such consumer is notified that the food which he receives contains horse meat or food products thereof.

SEC. 2. Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation prescribed thereunder, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$500, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 9, strike out lines 9, 10, and 11, and insert the following:

"SEC. 3. The health officer of the District of Columbia, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: On page 1, line 7, after the word "thereof", insert a period and strike out the balance of the section.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make a tear-jerking speech on the subject of horses, much as I might be tempted to try. I do want, however, to explain what this bill does and what my amendment will do to the bill.

This bill proposes that there shall be no sale of horse meat in the District of Columbia unless such meat or food product is plainly and conspicuously labeled, marked, branded, or tagged "horse meat," and so on. My amendment, in effect, says there shall be no sale of horse meat here, period.

The amendment proposes to place a period in line 7, after the word "thereof", and to strike out the balance of the first section, so, instead of providing for the labeling and tagging of horse meat, it will merely say that "30 days after the date of the enactment of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to sell or offer for sale within the District of Columbia to any person any horse meat or food product thereof."

That means that the bill will effectively prohibit the sale of horse meat within the District of Columbia. The penalty provisions of the bill provide a penalty of \$500 for its violation. That section would remain intact.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time we have the largest cattle population in this country that we have ever had and there is no need to slaughter horses. Indeed, there is a greater shortage of traction power than of cattle. Horses are needed today for purposes of traction and transportation. The Army is resuming its purchase of horses for those purposes; why encourage the killing of them? If it were a question of starving or eating horse meat I suppose it would be all right to eat horse meat, but for myself I cannot stomach the proposition and I have no desire to see horses sacrificed in this manner when beef cattle can be made available. Horses are too intelligent and have too fine a nervous system to be slaughtered.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, why does not the gentleman move to strike out all after the enacting clause?

Mr. CASE. If we were to do that it would not stop the sale of horse meat. The sale of horse meat is already going on. It is necessary to pass legislation to stop it. If we put a period after the word "thereof" as I have proposed by my amendment the sale of horse meat will be stopped by making its sale subject to a \$500 fine.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did I understand the gentleman to say he is opposed to the sale of horse meat in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CASE. I am opposed to the sale of horse meat for human food anywhere unless it is a matter of preventing starvation. We are a long way from that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A person has got to have proteins, and if there is no other kind of meat on the market except horse meat, why not let the people have it if they want it?

Mr. CASE. Beef can be made available. There are plenty of cattle in the country. Anyone who has any love for horses should support this amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have love for both horses and cattle.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Dakota, by his amendment, would destroy the legislation which has unanimously passed the Senate and comes to the House with a unanimous report from your Committee on the District of Columbia. I shall not at this time go into the merits of horse meat as edible food. As far as I know I have never eaten it. I have, however, had certain Members of this body tell me they have eaten it and found it nutritional and that they would be willing to eat it in the future.

This legislation simply proposes that within the District of Columbia when horse meat or horse-meat products are to be sold to the public the public shall be put on notice of that which they are buying. That is the purpose of the legislation. I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota is bad, and I trust the House will refuse to support it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Did the committee have any Member of the House come before it and testify personally that he had eaten horse meat and say that it ought to be made available generally?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The committee had no Member come before it and testify that he personally had eaten horse meat; no. What I said was that I had talked with Members who said they had eaten horse meat and had no objections to it. Those same persons would like to know, as well as the gentleman who would not want to eat it, what he or she were buying when they went into a store.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is there a law now that prohibits the sale of horse meat for human consumption in the District of Columbia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; there is not.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE), there were—ayes 13, noes 46.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to its final passage or rejection.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PERMIT CERTAIN BURIALS IN THE SCOTTISH RITE TEMPLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2828) to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the Thirty-third Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America, is hereby authorized to permit the burial of the remains of not to exceed two persons in vaults built for that purpose in its temple, situated on lot No. 800, in square 192, at the southeast corner of S and Sixteenth Streets NW., in the District of Columbia, under such sanitary regulations as shall be prescribed for such burials by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this measure comes before us having been introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSON]. It has the unanimous support of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and if enacted into law would allow the Grand Commander of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Mr. John H. Cowles, to be buried here in this temple within the District of Columbia. This is a Freemasonry structure for the construction of which Mr. Cowles was himself mostly responsible. The Governors of many States, Senators, Representatives, and officials of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry have said to us, in effect, that they would like to see this done.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the measure is meritorious.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next when the business on the Speaker's table has been finished and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS]?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION OF BLACK-OUTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2988) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended, be further amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"SEC. 14. During the existence of a state of war between the United States and any foreign country or nation, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to expend, in their discretion, from the money authorized by section 9 of this act to be borrowed, for personal services, supplies, and other expenses in connection with the coordination of nonprotective volunteer civilian services, not exceeding \$25,000 per year."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation comes here with the unanimous report of the House District Committee and would allow not to exceed \$25,000 within the District of Columbia black-out fund to be used for the coordination of certain services. The District Commissioners and the civilian defense officials of the District have presented a good case. I believe this legislation to be desirable. No new money is involved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF THE PLACING OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY HOMES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2618) to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to secure for each child under

16 years of age who is placed in a family home, other than his own or that of a relative within the third degree, such care and guidance as will serve the child's welfare and the best interests of the District of Columbia; and to secure for him custody and care as near as possible to that which should have been given him by his parents.

SEC. 2. Any person, firm, corporation, association, or public agency that receives or accepts a child under 16 years of age and places or offers to place such child for temporary or permanent care in a family home other than that of a relative within the third degree shall be deemed to be maintaining a child-placing agency. No child-placing agency shall be maintained in the District of Columbia without a license issued by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. Within 60 days after the passage of this act, the Commissioners shall appoint, after consultation with the Board of Public Welfare, a committee of eight persons to formulate and adopt rules and regulations, subject to the approval of the Commissioners, prescribing standards of placement, care, and services to be required of child-placing agencies, pursuant to the intent and purposes of this act. The committee shall be composed of a member of the Board of Public Welfare who shall act as chairman, of said committee, a member of the staff of the Health Department of the District of Columbia, a member of the staff of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, and one representative from each of five charitable organizations of the District of Columbia having an organized program for placing children in family homes. Each member of said committee shall serve for a term of 1 year and until his successor is appointed and qualified. The rules and regulations shall be reviewed by the committee annually and, subject to the approval of the Commissioners, may be amended when deemed necessary.

SEC. 4. An application for a license as a child-placing agency shall be made to the Commissioners on forms provided by them and in the manner prescribed. Before such license is issued the Board of Public Welfare shall arrange to have an investigation made of the activities and standards of care of the agency and shall consult with persons having official connection with the agency. If the Board is satisfied as to the good character and intent of the applicant, and that the agency is adequately financed, and that its staff, procedures, and services conform to the established standards of care, said Board shall recommend to the Commissioners that a license be issued.

A provisional license may be issued to any agency which is temporarily unable to conform to all the provisions of the established standards of care upon terms and conditions prescribed by the Commissioners upon recommendation of the Board of Public Welfare.

All licenses shall be issued for 1 year from the date thereof and may be renewed annually on the application of the agency, except that provisional licenses may be issued for not more than 3 successive years from the date of the passage of this act.

SEC. 5. No person other than the parent, guardian, or relative within the third degree, and no firm, corporation, association, or agency, other than a licensed child-placing agency, may place or arrange or assist in placing or arranging for the placement of a child under 16 years of age in a family home or for adoption. In accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated hereunder, any licensed child-placing agency may accept children for placement in family homes and shall have and maintain care, custody, and control of any such child until

returned to the person from whom received or until responsibility for the child is transferred to another child-welfare agency or terminated by the order of a court of competent jurisdiction.

Every such agency shall keep and maintain careful supervision of all children under its care, including those placed in family homes, and its officers or agents shall visit all such homes and families as often as may be necessary to promote the welfare of such child. Every such agency shall keep such records as shall be required by the rules and regulations promulgated hereunder and all records regarding children and all facts learned about children and their parents or relatives shall be deemed confidential and shall not be open to inspection or divulged except with the authority of the Board of Public Welfare.

Such agency shall in no case charge or receive from the person or persons legally adopting any child any compensation whatsoever therefor; and in no case shall any person taking a child with the intention of adoption demand or receive from such agency any compensation whatsoever for the care of such child even though it shall be returned to the agency.

SEC. 6. Whenever a licensed child-placing agency shall have been given the permanent care and guardianship of any child and the rights of the parent or parents of such child shall have been terminated by order of a court of competent jurisdiction or by a legally executed relinquishment of parental rights, the agency is vested with parental rights and may consent to the adoption of the child pursuant to the statutes regulating adoption procedure. Except in proceedings for adoption no parent may voluntarily assign or otherwise transfer to another his rights and duties with respect to the permanent care and control of a child under 16 years of age unless such relinquishment of parental rights is made to a licensed child-placing agency. Such relinquishment of parental rights shall be a statement in writing signed by the person relinquishing such parental rights in the presence of at least one witness who shall subscribe his name thereto and acknowledge the same before a representative of the licensed child-placing agency. Said relinquishment of parental rights shall be recorded and filed in a properly sealed file in the office of the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. The seal of said file shall not be broken except for good cause shown and upon the written order of a justice of said court.

SEC. 7. The Commissioners may refuse to reissue or may revoke or suspend the license of any child-placing agency after full hearing on proof of violation of any provisions of this act or the rules and regulations promulgated hereunder. Before any license shall be suspended or revoked the holder thereof shall have notice in writing of the charge or charges and shall, at the date and place specified in said notice, which shall be at least 5 days after the service thereof, be given a hearing by said Commissioners, or their designated agents, with a full opportunity to produce testimony in his, her, or its behalf. Any licensee whose license has been suspended or revoked may, after the expiration of 90 days, on application to the said Commissioners, have the same reinstated or reissued upon satisfactory proof that the disqualification has ceased.

SEC. 8. Any person, firm, corporation, association, or public agency who conducts a child-placing agency without a license as provided for in this act or who violates any of the provisions of this act or the rules and regulations promulgated under this act shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$300 or imprisoned for not more than 90 days, or both. Prosecution for violations of this act shall be upon information

in the criminal division of the municipal court of the District of Columbia by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 9. That sections 173, and 402 to 411, both inclusive, of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 10. This act shall become effective 4 months after date of the approval of this act, except section 3 hereof, which shall become effective on the date of the approval of this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is of importance to the House, to the District of Columbia and to the over-all theory involved in the philosophy of child placement. I should state to the House that during the Seventy-seventh Congress a bill with a similar purpose was presented and passed. It failed of enactment in the Senate and comes back to us in the Seventy-eighth Congress a very real problem under the impact of war, the necessity for the measure being greater, we believe, than in past years.

It deals with the placement of children in family homes in the District of Columbia. May I say that there will be at least three amendments offered to the measure that the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee has discussed with the authors. I feel that in connection with the two amendments to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], and the amendment to be presented by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], those amendments do not weaken the purpose of the legislation, but, on the contrary, tend to clarify and to bring the issue fairly before the House.

I yield first to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. As I read this bill there is nothing in the legislation that provides for supervision or visitation of children who have been legally adopted.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It was not proposed that that phase is to be covered. That is in another sphere.

Mr. DISNEY. I want reassurance that this act cannot be construed in the gentleman's judgment as implying or providing that visitation or supervision of children already legally adopted may happen under this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I reassure the gentleman on that point. The District Committee's consideration of it did not contemplate such action.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DISNEY: Page 4, line 18, after the word "child", strike out the period, add a semicolon and insert "Provided, That legally adopted children shall not be subject to such supervision and visitation or other supervision or visitation."

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of line 14, page 4, the bill reads as follows:

Every agency shall keep and maintain careful supervision of all children under its care, including those placed in family homes, and its officers or agents shall visit all such homes and families as often as may be necessary to promote the welfare of such child.

My amendment provides that where a child has been legally adopted, that ends supervision. The adoption of children has become an important thing in our civilization and if we are to permit supervision and visitation of families where the child has already been legally adopted, we will discourage adoption. None of us would want to adopt a child, then have someone from a public agency come around all the time.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman's amendment should be adopted. It is one that is sound, it is right, and it will lead to more happiness on the part of all the people involved.

Mr. DISNEY. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me because he and I have had some experience along this line. If we do not avoid the idea that somebody in the department of a State or the Federal Government or the District of Columbia has something to do with the child after it has become ours, then it would be undesirable to have this statute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the explanation the gentleman from Oklahoma makes is correct. This legislation is aimed at doing away with the so-called black market in babies, which has grown to great proportions in the District of Columbia. In other words, the setting up of unlawful brokerage in children within the District of Columbia. I have talked with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the ranking minority member of the committee, in connection with this amendment, and we shall accept it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a child-adoption law, of course the first thing is to get the right kind of a family. I might ask this of the chairman of the committee. The bill safeguards the child in the selection of a home, I assume?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; that is true, and that is the purpose of the legislation. May I say this to the gentleman—

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a complete answer and a good one. I am satisfied.

If it does safeguard the child, there is no reason why we should have any of these new dealers down here fussing around afterward. It is all too evident that every time that little group get their fingers in the pie things go wrong. You remember the President's veto came up here the other day. I do not know who in the world wrote that for him, but it is just too bad.

WAS THE PRESIDENT FACETIOUS, OR IS HE IGNORANT OF LABOR POLICY?

In his message of June 25, 1943, vetoing the Connally-Smith bill, the President, among other things, said:

I doubt whether the public generally are familiar with these provisions. I doubt

whether the Congress had the opportunity fully to appraise the effects of these provisions upon war production.

The fact is that the President himself displayed an amazing ignorance of fundamental labor policy and an utter disregard of the reasons for substantive law.

Disapproving those provisions of the bill which provide for a secret ballot and for a cooling-off period of 30 days, the President, among other things, said:

Section 8 requires the representative of employees of a war contractor to give notice of a labor dispute which threatens seriously to interrupt war production to the Secretary of Labor, the National War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board in order to give the employees the opportunity to express themselves by secret ballot whether they will permit such interruption of war production.

It would force a labor leader who is trying to prevent a strike in accordance with his no-strike pledge, to give the notice which would cause the taking of a strike ballot and might actually precipitate a strike.

In wartime we cannot sanction strikes with or without notice.

Section 8 further makes it mandatory that the National Labor Relations Board on the thirtieth day after the giving of the notice take a secret ballot among the employees in the "plants, mines, facilities, bargaining unit, or bargaining units," as the case may be, on the question of whether they will stop work. This requirement would open the whole controversy over "bargaining units," a fruitful source of controversy and of bitter jurisdictional strife.

Section 8 ignores completely labor's no-strike pledge and provides in effect for strike notices and strike ballots. Far from discouraging strikes, these provisions would stimulate labor unrest and give Government sanction to strike agitations.

The 30 days allowed before the strike vote is taken under Government auspices might well become a boiling period instead of a cooling period. The thought and energies of the workers would be diverted from war production to vote getting.

Is it possible that the President and his advisers are ignorant of the history of labor legislation which has been presented to Congress in the last few years? Is it possible that the President, who is on terms of warm personal friendship with labor leaders, is unaware of their views, of their testimony?

In April of 1941, before the Rules Committee of the House, there was pending an application for a rule on H. R. 4139. Mr. George Meany, who was then secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor and who was also a member of the Mediation Board which was then in existence, appeared as a witness. Among other things, he said:

This bill provides a compulsory mediation feature.

The bill makes it unlawful for employees to quit their jobs for any reason that they see fit to quit, if in quitting would in any way impede the progress of national defense contracts.

We would be opposed to this bill if this cooling-off period were only 10 minutes instead of 25 days, because of the destruction of that fundamental right that we cherish and have cherished since the institution of this democracy under which we live.

If Congress can compel people to work against their will for 25 days, then I submit, Mr. Chairman and members of the commit-

tee, that Congress can compel them to work for 25 months or 25 years.

Then, speaking of the policy of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Meany—and don't forget he was speaking officially for that organization—said:

I want the committee to understand that our policy goes not against the cooling-off period as a matter of agreement between employers and employees; it is against the cooling-off period as a matter of statute law.

I have personally signed agreements as long as I have been connected with the trade-union movement, that call for a cooling-off period. We agree with the employer that when the expiration of an agreement is reached, we set a 3-months period aside in which you have to give notice. That is standard practice and has been for 50 years. That provides for a cooling-off period by agreement between employers and employees so that it cannot be used as a weapon by one side against the other.

That is an agreed, a standard practice that we have had for 50 years and we believe in that practice and we insert it in our agreements at every possible opportunity.

Later, Mr. Cox of the Rules Committee, asked:

Mr. Cox. If he (the individual) is impeding the national defense program, shouldn't he be brought in under the law?

Mr. MEANY. I don't believe in the law so I don't believe anybody should be brought in under a law such as this.

Incidentally, Mr. Meany also expressed a view on the draft law. He was asked and he answered:

Mr. Cox. From what you have said, I take it that you must have been against the draft.

Mr. MEANY. No, I was not.

Mr. Cox. In other words, you favor the drafting of boys to bleed and die for their country but you are against the drafting of others to work and produce.

Mr. MEANY. I think it is entirely different.

So it is evident from the testimony of the secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor that, for 50 years, that organization has followed the policy of a cooling-off period, not of 30 days, but of 90 days, but that it now objects to that policy becoming the law of the land.

On the question of whether there should be a secret ballot before a strike is called, Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, is also on record. Appearing before the House Committee on the Judiciary on May 7, 1941, on hearings which were then being held on delays in national defense preparations, Mr. Green testified:

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Green, a moment ago you spoke about when a strike has been officially approved. I am just wondering whether or not in the consideration of legislation you would feel that the Congress ought to enact legislation requiring the taking of a vote, a secret vote, on the question of the strike by the members of a craft?

Mr. GREEN. I do not think you need any legislation. That is the policy of the American Federation of Labor, to take secret strike votes.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir. Now, if that is the policy of your organization would you object if we were to write that policy into law?

Mr. GREEN. What for?

Mr. WALTER. Well, perhaps there would be other people affected who have not adopted that fine policy.

Mr. GREEN. That is the principle of compulsion which labor resents.

Mr. WALTER. Is it a principle of compulsion or is it merely an instance of the democratic processes being complied with?

Mr. GREEN. It is a form of governmental control, a form of governmental order saying to labor, "You must do this and so." Labor would probably do it, all right. It is just like the adoption of our no-strike policy. We have done that wholeheartedly and willingly. But the probabilities are if Congress would say, "You must do that," then there would be rebellion.

Organized labor, through its official spokesmen, having told Congress that for 50 years it had followed the policy of requiring a cooling-off period of 90 days, what reason can there possibly be against incorporating that policy in the fundamental law of the land governing labor relations?

William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, having solemnly advised a committee of the House that it was the policy of that organization "to take secret strike votes," what reason can there be for the President to object to the enactment of that policy into law?

Logically, there is only one reason for the President's objection to section 8, and that is that he does not want a democratic policy, which has shown its worth by lessening strikes, to apply to his political allies.

The President's argument, the argument of William Green, that, if a policy which is good becomes a law, it will be resented and, as Green said, will lead to "rebellion," rests upon the assumption that the few who disregard the Nation's welfare should be coddled and excused from complying with a policy which is necessary if we are to win the war.

With just as much reason might the President and William Green argue that, because citizens as a rule are not drunk and disorderly in public places, there should be no law against drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

Let me repeat. The President either did not know what he was writing about when he penned his veto comments on the eighth section of the Connally-Smith bill or he disregarded the basic reason for all legislation which is intended to lessen misconduct on the part of the citizen.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Now, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman referred to the President's veto message and wondered who wrote it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Had he read the reasons assigned by the President for vetoing that bill at the time he voted to override the veto?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but I heard the veto message read prior to the vote.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman had not, does he not think he should have before he voted on that important matter?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I heard it, and hearing was enough. Insofar as it referred to section 8, it was illogical and unsound.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: On page 5, line 14, after the period, insert a new sentence as follows: "In any such adoption proceeding filed in the District of Columbia, which is consented to by a child-placing agency licensed pursuant to this act, the provisions of section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to regulate proceedings in adoption in the District of Columbia,' approved August 25, 1937, as amended (50 Stat. 806), requiring the petition to state the name, age, race, occupation, and address of the natural parents shall not apply."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the District of Columbia is to be commended upon this bill (H. R. 2618). It is a very good bill. I think they have handled an important subject in a very splendid manner. When we are legislating in reference to children, we are really legislating in reference to the worth-while things in America. I am sure this bill is going to mean untold happiness and contentment on the part of hundreds and thousands of people who will be affected by it throughout the years to come.

Let me tell you briefly what my amendment does. In this bill there is a provision that the parent or parents of a child may relinquish that child to a licensed child-placing agency, and in turn that placing agency may go into court and consent to the child's adoption. They have been very careful to keep matters in reference to the parental background of the child confidential; in fact, this bill provides that this relinquishment paper signed by the parent or parents is sealed by the court and must remain in a special file unopened. My amendment merely makes the existing adoption law conform to the spirit of this bill.

The existing adoption law prescribes that when you file a petition that petition must state the names, addresses, occupations, and so forth, of the natural parents. If that law remains as it is, many of the fine things under the bill (H. R. 2618) will be lost. I hope the committee will see fit to accept my amendment, which provides that when a placing agency consents to an adoption that the information as to the name, address, and so forth of the natural parents need not be given in the petition that is filed in court.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have gone over the matter with the gentleman who offers the amendment and I have discussed it with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] the ranking minority Member. I think it is proper that the committee agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I feel that we in this legislation want to do simply what has been done in approximately 35

States, that is, to protect the health and happiness of a child who is placed in a home, to assist in the sanctity of that home after such adoption has been made, but we certainly desire to bring no hardship on any proper placement. I think the gentleman's amendment will help to clarify the matter.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's attitude, and I hope that one of these days his splendid committee will bring in legislation which will double the taxes on houses and apartments here in the city of Washington that do not admit families with children. Such a practice is barbarism and should not be tolerated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The future of America marches on the feet of its children, and certainly we want a happy and healthy childhood for all our children.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. DISNEY. I call attention to the language on line 25, page 4—

Such agency shall in no case charge or receive from the person or persons legally adopting any child any compensation whatsoever therefor.

I am very doubtful of that policy.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that is a matter that might well bear attention.

Mr. DISNEY. My information is that founding homes ought to be able to make a charge against the person taking the child.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it would be a better situation if the adopting parents were required to pay for an investigation, because it would insure something along the line of financial stability, and also prove their good intentions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think we might well leave that question to the discretion of the Senate, which undoubtedly will have a hearing on this bill. I appreciate the importance of the issue that has been raised.

Mr. DISNEY. I think it is important.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think there are two sides to that matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DISNEY: Page 6, lines 23 and 24, strike out "or the rules and regulations promulgated under this act shall."

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, this strikes out the provision that makes a violation of a rule or regulation a crime. We ought to quit this nonsense in this House in making crimes of violations of rules and regulations. The act already provides that anyone who violates its provisions shall be guilty of an offense. Let us forget this business of making a violation of rules and regulations a crime.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the gentleman's contention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the District business for the day.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to permit the Washington Terminal Co. to use, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, for parking space for passenger motor vehicles, that part of the United States Capitol Grounds described as squares S-721 and N-721. Any such use shall be in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may deem necessary and proper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent for the consideration of this measure because I think it should pass before the prospective recess in order to relieve the condition to which it pertains.

We are all familiar with the very crowded traffic conditions at the Union Station, and the practical impossibility of people going there with their families when they are leaving, or meeting friends, or helping them on the way to their trains. We have, just east of the Union Station, two lots which are not being used, which could very readily afford parking space for passenger motor vehicles. Arrangements have already been made for the accommodation of the Army and the Navy cars and trucks which are taken to the station. This bill is for the benefit of the public in general. This will be without any expense whatever to the Federal Government, and the necessary policing will be done. If any injury is done to the property in any way, it will be returned to the Government in its original condition without any expense to the Government. There will be no charge for the parking; there will be no toll. This is simply an effort to relieve that terrible condition of congestion by the use of as much of this space as may be necessary for the parking of passenger automobiles.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I rise to concur in the statement of the chairman and to advise the House that this is a report from the committee by unanimous consent. There will be no cost to the Government. This is to be handled entirely by the Terminal Co., and the property will be returned in its original form.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman for that statement. The situation calls for prompt action on this measure in order that the public generally may be relieved of this unfortunate situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF PERSONS DISABLED IN INDUSTRY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the statement in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2397) "making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 17; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the first line of the said amendment strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$260,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9 and 10.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN,
KARL STEFAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 2397, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following detailed statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 appropriates \$410,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$310,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2 appropriates \$288,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$248,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3 appropriates \$10,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4 appropriates \$225,000 instead of \$210,000 as proposed by the House and \$230,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 strikes out provision relating to disability or death benefits to alien enemy detainees as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates \$115,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$110,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7 authorizes purchase, etc., of two station wagons as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates \$4,100,000 instead of \$2,413,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,255,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 appropriates \$1,214,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12 strikes out limitation on expenditures for operation of observatories as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13 limits amount which may be expended for departmental salaries to \$1,310,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,260,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14 appropriates \$1,359,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,309,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15 strikes out a limitation relating to dairy products as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 appropriates \$295,000 as proposed by the Senate and limits expenditures for salaries to \$260,000 instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17 appropriates \$110,000 as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement and the motion relating to each authorized to be made by the managers is stated:

Amendment No. 9 appropriates \$33,940,358 for civilian pilot training. The managers will move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment providing for \$29,400,000 instead of the amount proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10 continues available until June 30, 1944, the appropriation for development of landing areas, fiscal year 1943. The managers will move to concur in the amendment with an amendment making the appropriations in the bill available from July 1, 1943, regardless of the date of enactment.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN,
KARL STEFAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized. Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is very much I can add to the statement of the managers on the part of the House, which is self-explanatory.

Of a total of \$31,776,000 over the amount of the bill as passed by the House, only approximately \$280,000 represents restoration of cuts effected by the committee and by the House. The balance of the increase is the result of supplemental estimates received by the Senate after the bill had been considered by the House, including, however, an amount of \$295,000 for field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The Members will recall that when we brought the bill before the House we made special reference in the report, Report No. 343, on page 35, as follows:

The reduction in the appropriation for 1943 of \$444,000, as reflected in the Budget estimates, is accounted for by a decrease of \$14,000 recommended for the Washington office and elimination of the Bureau's domestic field offices, which carried an appropriation of \$430,000 in the fiscal year 1943.

With respect to the latter item the committee has allowed the Bureau of the Budget recommendation to stand temporarily, without prejudice to the status of the offices as to permanent continuance or discontinuance. The committee has, under authority of House Resolution No. 69, instituted an inquiry of its own with the view of securing complete factual data for the subsequent determination as to their disposition.

The examination referred to in the report has been made. A report was made to the committee and the committee assembled to consider the report. I was authorized, as chairman of the committee, to make known the facts of the report to the Members of the Senate having jurisdiction over this matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence between myself, as chairman of the committee, and at the instigation of the committee, and the Secretary of Commerce, as well as the reply of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jones, to me, be placed in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The correspondence referred to follows:

MAY 25, 1943.

THE HON. JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to inform you that the investigation of the field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, performed under authority of House Resolution No. 69, has been completed. The report of this investigation was dis-

cussed by the State, Justice, and Commerce subcommittee in executive session today, following which I was authorized to convey to you certain thoughts of the subcommittee concerning this matter.

First of all, let me state that the subcommittee, as assembled, agreed that there now exists a definite need for the type of service being rendered by the field offices of the Bureau, although not to the degree that this need existed prior to our present emergency.

Certain officials of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce indicated to our investigators that three offices, namely, Memphis, Cincinnati, and Indianapolis could be eliminated without detriment to the field organization or to the service being rendered. The subcommittee feels that there are other comparatively less important offices which should also be closed during this war period, and the Bureau should exert every effort to do so and to reduce this service to essential wartime requirements.

The severest criticism contained in the report on the investigation is directed at the Washington office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for its laxity in directing and coordinating the activities of the field organization. The following excerpt from the report on the investigation is given for your information:

"It is definitely true that the efficiency of any given office depends almost entirely on the individual in charge of that office. The administrative control from Washington is very lax, and there is definite room for improvement in this regard."

Another, and rather astounding, disclosure reported deals with publicizing the offices and the services that these offices are equipped to render. Quoting again from the report:

"It was furthermore observed by several businessmen and representatives of business organizations interviewed during the investigation that the field service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce was not particularly well publicized, many businessmen did not know of its existence, and that the service could perform services of greater value to the business public in general through better publicity."

That the conditions as quoted existed, even to a minor degree, is both surprising and disappointing to the subcommittee, especially when it is reminded that these offices have been in existence for a period in excess of 20 years.

This information is transmitted to you for whatever action you deem appropriate under the circumstances. However, it is the hope of this subcommittee that the situation as reported and above described may be soon corrected, at least to the extent that further appropriations for this activity may be more fully justified.

The findings of this investigation have been made known to the Senate subcommittee handling the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on State,
Justice, and Commerce Appropriations.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 31, 1943.

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of May 25, informing me of the completion of the investigation of the field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as authorized by House Resolution No. 69.

As you know, I have expressed my conviction that these offices have highly important functions both in war and peace and it is gratifying that your subcommittee agrees there is a definite need for their services.

That your investigators should have found certain reasons for criticism is, of course, regrettable, and while steps have already been taken which should correct the principal difficulties mentioned, every effort will be made to conform with the suggestions you have made.

Although a large part of the work of the offices is directly connected with the war effort, it is my desire that they be a medium through which business may be served, both in meeting wartime needs and in preparing for a high level of production when the war ends.

Some further observations on the points raised in your letter are included in the attached memorandum. I assure you that your interest and cooperation in this matter have been very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

MEMORANDUM TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS OF LOUIS C. RABAUT, CHAIRMAN, ON BEHALF OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

A careful study of the views expressed by Chairman RABAUT on behalf of the subcommittee confirms our confidence in the high character of the personnel of the investigating group, their objective approach to the problem, and the thoroughness of the study made of the activities of the field service. The investigators now possess facts and observations obtained from a detached point of view which should be distinctly beneficial to the officials charged with the responsibility of administering the field service. It is hoped that an opportunity may be presented to confer with them.

The view that the service be confined to essential wartime requirements is in accord with the policy enunciated by you during the early days of the defense effort. Although a major portion of the activities presently engaging the attention of the field offices is directly connected with the war effort, and effective wartime aid has been given to both Government and business, the need for continued attention to wartime requirements is recognized.

The information, assistance, and guidance given to businessmen to enable them to meet the problems arising out of the conversion of the commerce and industry of the Nation to a wartime basis carries with it another important responsibility. It is most essential that all businessmen, especially owners of small plants, or proprietors of wholesale or retail establishments be given whatever assistance is possible to help them prepare for the reconversion of their plants or businesses to a peacetime basis after the war is won so that productive private employment can be quickly reestablished at a high level.

Specific reference is made to the offices in Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and Memphis. It is realized that careful consideration should be given to strengthening these and certain other offices. After proper consultation with businessmen in these cities, if no plan can be evolved to make them more effective, their activities should be absorbed by other offices where we now have effective representation.

For a number of years the Bureau was represented in Cincinnati by a so-called cooperative office, an arrangement under which an employee of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce was designated as foreign-trade manager at \$1 a year, assisted by an employee paid by the Bureau. To enable the Bureau to have better representation in Cincinnati, the assistant to the foreign-trade manager, a Bureau employee, was placed in charge of the Bureau's activities, the chamber providing, without charge, the necessary office space and some clerical assistance. The total cost to the Bureau for the operation of this office

is \$2,200. A similar arrangement exists in Indianapolis, where the total Bureau cost is approximately \$3,200 per year, with one employee on the Bureau's pay roll. The Memphis office, opened in July 1926, occupies space in a Federal building and is staffed by two employees at a total cost of \$6,000 a year.

Recognizing the need for more effective administration of the field offices and to provide further integration of the activities of the various Bureaus of the Department of Commerce in the field, particularly the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and the Bureau of the Census, R. C. Miller, Assistant to the Secretary, was designated by you as director of the field service on November 20, 1942. Shortly thereafter, as a further step to strengthen the administrative control in Washington, Joseph A. Mack, who had served in the New York office for over 13 years, was transferred to Washington and given the position of supervising the operation of the field service. The means have been provided, therefore, to overcome the laxity cited and very definite improvements in the service are already in evidence in spite of the uncertainties which have confronted the employees since last December.

The observation concerning the publicizing of the facilities of the field offices for aiding businessmen is well taken. The deficiency in this respect is fully realized and steps have already been taken to correct this condition in cooperation with various commercial and industrial groups. In an exchange of correspondence with Herbert L. Mercready, president of the National Industrial Advertisers Association, Inc., 120 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill., it was agreed that there is a definite need for more adequate merchandising of the services of the field office so that a fuller utilization of these services may be made by businessmen throughout the country. Mr. Mercready is preparing to confer with Department and Bureau officials and has offered his complete cooperation as well as that of the association which he heads. Similar discussions are under way with the National Federation of Sales Executives, a Nation-wide organization with headquarters in New York, and with the editors of Sales Management, a publication with wide circulation and contacts among sales personnel. Promise of complete cooperation has been received and a program to achieve the objectives of the committee will be carried on without cost to the Government. Every effort will be made to further develop the favorable public relations which exist between the offices and the businessmen in a number of cities on a wider scale so that businessmen may make greater use of the aid the field offices are in a position to give them in solving their wartime problems.

Mr. RABAUT. The amount allowed by the conference for field offices was \$295,000. The suggestion was made to the department that some of the offices could probably be discontinued during the war period. It is left somewhat in their discretion. The committee also criticized the department for the fact that the offices were not as well known in their respective districts as they should have been to businessmen of the area. The department has promised to correct the situation.

There is an item, "Civil Aeronautics Administration; establishment of air navigation facilities in Alaska, \$1,687,000; civilian pilot training program, \$29,400,000." Bureau of Standards, a new item, for a wind tunnel for the testing of projectiles very necessary to the war effort, \$110,000.

The amount, as I said before, for the restoration of cuts was \$284,000. Those sums, added to the amount of \$295,000 for the restoration of the field offices, makes a total of \$31,776,000.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report was unanimously reported by all conferees on both sides of the aisle. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has explained the main features of the report. I think I have nothing further to offer. I would request that the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. RABAUT. I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] who has been a very helpful member of the committee.

WAR TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in favor of the \$29,400,000 which it is proposed to devote to so-called civilian pilot training under the C. A. A. War Training Service. This is apart from the training programs carried on by the C. A. A. for both the Army and Navy, and financed from Army and Navy funds.

The appropriation now under consideration is to cover the training of about 8,600 of the Air Force reservists which you have heard referred to as "the forgotten men of wartime aviation." They are the last of that group which many of us feel got a pretty raw deal at the hands of the Government, and all of them who pass this training successfully will become flight instructors. They are going to have full status now as members of the Army Air Forces. They are being called to active duty as they take this training, will wear the uniform, and be paid \$50 a month. The C. A. A. will provide the flight and ground training, food, and shelter.

I favor this appropriation because I am sure these boys have a real contribution to make as flight instructors in the war effort. I felt the same way last year, and so did the Congress for it provided money for the program under which these men were originally recruited.

Let me review their case briefly. They volunteered last autumn and winter as enlisted reservists to be trained by the C. A. A. for noncombat Army flying such as glider, transport service, and instructor pilots. When voluntary enlistments were stopped, these reservists found themselves in a sort of no-man's land. They had volunteered on the basis that the C. A. A. would pay the costs of their training, but they would receive no salary. On the other hand, all the new trainees coming to the C. A. A. on assignment from the Army and Navy were on active duty, with pay, and these new trainees had the right-of-way. There were not enough facilities for everybody and in the shuffles and readjustments, the poor reservist volunteers usually got the short end of the stick. They were subjected to delays between courses sometimes for months. To make things worse, many of them were older men, above the 26-year combat age, who had family responsibilities.

ties. But they drew no salaries. They underwent severe hardships. The C. A. A. wanted to pay them, and urged that they be put on a pay basis, but there was no legal way that they could be paid salaries while on inactive reserve status. You will recall that the Congress corrected this recently in Public Law 50 by appropriating \$3,500,000 to pay them \$50 a month while training or awaiting assignment between courses, and limiting the paywaiting period between courses to 2 months. The pay was made retroactive to last December.

Now about 8,600 of these volunteers are to be carried through to become flight instructors, if we make this appropriation. I say we should do it. The C. A. A. training program has been the most prolific source of flight instructors which the armed forces have had. It has poured out thousands upon thousands of skilled pilots to teach the first stages of flying in the war program. It is not generally understood that all the Army's primary-stage training is done by civilian schools under contract. And it is not generally known, either, that more than two-thirds of the flight instructors doing that work have come from this C. A. A. program. That is proof enough that they are capable and well trained. They are carrying most of the load. This appropriation is just to give us several thousand more of them, which the Army has agreed that it wants and needs. At least, the Army says it wants them right now, and the best we can do is to proceed on the assumption that it will not change its mind during the training period.

There are several thousand more of these enlisted reservists who probably would not bet on it. They are the so-called excess who cannot be fitted into the present program. Those who are young enough and physically fit enough are being permitted to enter the Army's regular flying cadet training for combat work. Some of the others will be graciously permitted to apply for active duty in the air forces as enlisted men. The remainder will be returned to civilian life and reported back to their draft boards. And all this through no fault of their own.

The plain truth is that these men are excess only because the Army now wants fewer such flyers than it wanted less than a year ago. I believe I am a patriotic American, and I know there are great difficulties involved in running a war, particularly one with seven or eight battle fronts. I think our air forces are doing a splendid job on those fronts, and I am not inclined to be small about mistakes they appear to make in the training program here at home.

I have seen the Army flatly repudiate big programs twice after asking the C. A. A. to carry them out and after most of the students had been recruited and were in training; and I said nothing critical about it. I have seen hundreds of flying schools and colleges and universities summarily dropped from this program to center it in a smaller number of big schools. I did not like it, but it seemed reasonable to go along, as far as

one can with the Army, because it has the responsibility of fighting the war.

It is high time, however, for somebody to get up and tell the Army that they ought to be able to make up their minds with great deal less pulling and hauling of people back and forth. It seems likely to me that, no matter what tactical and strategic changes may be necessary with the shifts and changes in the war, there will be relatively few major changes necessary away back in the beginning stages of flight training, where new cadets are learning fundamentals. Yet the Army's position is summed up very well in a June 13 news article put out by the C. A. A. War Training Service. This article explains that these 8,600 enlisted reservists are to be called to active duty, and then it says—I quote:

All the foregoing arrangements are subject to changes in the plans in the armed services.

That is the end of the quotation.

The odd thing, to me, is that the Navy never seems to have any trouble fitting the C. A. A. program into its plans, without shoving people around. The C. A. A. is doing a big job for the Navy right now, as well as for the Army. Every naval air cadet starts his flying in the C. A. A. program, and thousands take additional courses with it, including commissioned naval officers who are transferred to the Bureau of Aeronautics from other branches of the service. I read recently that the C. A. A. program is going to give first-stage flight training to well over 30,000 naval flyers during the fiscal year just beginning.

These things are said, I hope, in a constructive spirit. Our Air Forces are proving that they are sound and good. But one of them could be just as good if it was a great deal more considerate of the civilian colleges and commercial flying schools that have been such a great help to it, and of the civilians who go in, often at personal sacrifice, to try to help get the job done.

I have been asked how many war training programs the C. A. A. is carrying on. Formerly, the programs included training for glider, liaison, transport and instructor pilots for the Army, plus precombat and instructor courses for the Navy. All courses were financed out of C. A. A. appropriations.

Today, the situation is this. Under the \$29,400,000 C. A. A.-W. T. S. appropriation, work is going forward in a program designed to give instructor training to some 8,600 students for the Army. In addition to this W. T. S. program, C. A. A. is also doing training paid for by the Army and Navy. The Army training consists of a 10-hour screening course for 70,000 Army reservists. The Navy-C. A. A. program embraces training for 37,780 men, all of whom are given the W. T. S. elementary course, some going on to complete the secondary.

DEVELOPMENT OF LANDING AREAS

An item regarding the development of landing areas in which many Members are interested because they have airports which have not been completed in their districts will be found on page 62, line 1, known as Amendment No. 10, under

der the head "Development of landing areas." The estimates for this item were not available at the time of the regular hearings by the House committee and was placed in the bill by the Senate. It refers to the reappropriation of certain funds in the Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. The important information about this item is the reappropriation of \$99,000,000 which is intended to be used for the completion of 65 airports which the Army and Navy consider of military necessity. These are part of the original 267 airports which the W. P. A. had under construction and which were left in an uncompleted condition when W. P. A. liquidated. This matter was fully discussed on the floor of the House recently when we had before us the last deficiency bill. The membership of the House may be interested to know that of these 267 W. P. A. airport projects 103 have been completed; 71 have been taken over by the Army or Navy, and it is assumed that either the Army or Navy is operating the 71 airports and probably will improve or complete them. A request is before the Bureau of the Budget for \$8,000,000 for the completion of 28 others which have not yet been designated by either the Army or Navy as of military necessity. The 65 airports affected by this amendment and which are designated as of military necessity are in the program of the C. A. A., known as the D. L. A. or Development of Landing Areas. These 65 airports in this D. L. A. program are located in 31 States, and for the information of the membership, I include their locations:

Alabama: Demopolis.
Connecticut: Groton, Hartford, New Haven, Windham.
Delaware: Dover.
Florida: Jacksonville No. 2, Winter Haven.
Idaho: Lewiston.
Indiana: Evansville.
Kansas: Wichita.
Louisiana: New Orleans, A. Callender; Shreveport.
Maryland: Baltimore, Salisbury.
Massachusetts: Fitchburg - Leominster; Hyannis; North Andover, Lawrence; Westfield.
Michigan: Pellston.
Minnesota: Duluth.
Mississippi: Greenville; Greenwood; Jackson, Hinds County.
Missouri: Kansas City, Grandview; St. Louis.
Montana: Havre.
Nebraska: Norfolk.
New Jersey: Atlantic City.
New York: Buffalo; Niagara Falls; Westhampton, Suffolk County.
North Carolina: Elizabeth City, Greensboro-High Point, Kinston, Washington, Wilmington, Winston-Salem.
North Dakota: Grand Forks.
Oklahoma: Cushing, Stillwater.
Oregon: Astoria, North Bend, Ontario.
Pennsylvania: Johnstown.
South Carolina: Beaufort; Charleston, Municipal; Columbia, Owens.
South Dakota: Aberdeen.
Texas: Beaumont, Conroe, Fort Worth, Nacogdoches, Longview.

Vermont: Barre-Montpelier, Burlington.

Virginia: Norfolk.

Washington: Aberdeen - Hoquiam, Deer Park, Olympia, Port Angeles, Yakima.

West Virginia: Parkersburg; Wiley Ford, Cumberland, Md.

Wisconsin: Janesville.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I call the gentleman's attention to amendment No. 15 of the conference report, in the bill on page 69, which I note strikes out an amendment adopted by the House prohibiting the use of any part of this appropriation for promotional work and investigation of butter or substitutes for butter.

Mr. STEFAN. It has to do with studies of dairy substitutes. I want to tell my colleague from Minnesota that we went into this matter very thoroughly in conference and we understand that this work is completed and they will do no more of it hereafter. They have finished with it. The gentleman knows my interest in protecting the dairy industry and the interest of farmers who milk cows and produce our badly needed dairy products.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman has been most active in protecting the interests of the dairy industry. However, I want it strictly understood and I want the RECORD to show what the gentleman has had to say, that is, that the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce will not engage in this type of practice which we sought to prohibit.

Mr. STEFAN. No more advertising of any kind of product—butter substitutes or otherwise, so we were informed, and I think I have that assurance from my chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and my colleague from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. It was with the understanding that there would be no further work along this line that the House conferees receded.

Mr. STEFAN. That is my understanding and we had that assurance in conference with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get a complete confirmation of the agreement we had in the Senate on this particular amendment, I want to ask my chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], that he insert the statement made in connection with this program from the Bureau of Commerce in connection with the advertisement or publicity of butter substitutes and that nothing further would be carried on with sums provided in this bill.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Nebraska is absolutely correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I just wanted to verify the statement from the chairman so that the RECORD will show that the Bureau of Domestic Commerce would not spend any of this appropriation

tion for promotional work or in advertisement of dairy products or any substitutes.

Mr. RABAUT. May I say to my friend the gentleman from Minnesota that with the elimination of this particular item from the bill in which the gentleman is so much interested I can absolutely assure him it is a closed book. It was inherited from the W. P. A., and with such inheritance certain studies were completed. They were completed along lines that were beneficial to the Army and the Navy, and I know the gentleman from Minnesota is in agreement with the war effort and would not want any curtailment placed in the bill that might be injurious to the military effort.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is correct in that respect, but furthermore we do not want any Government agency to use public money to advertise any particular product or to promote the sale of any substitute.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman can be fully assured that none of the funds can be used for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] had completed his statement?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I had not.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska 10 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As I understand, the field officers of Commerce are delighted with this arrangement.

Mr. STEFAN. Those field officers are restored in the bill, as the conference report shows. We are very anxious to help business—small business especially—and we are assured we will see some results. We want this service more available to private business and want the work extended so as to help small business to survive.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I compliment the gentleman from Nebraska, not only for his interest, but his knowledge of this subject of the aviation section as it affects our war effort. I think what the gentleman has said about the intrinsic value of the C. A. A. programs as they fit themselves into the wartime effort is very well put to the House today. I do feel that criticism made of the Army—

Mr. STEFAN. It is intended only as helpful and constructive criticism.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is constructive criticism and I join with the gentleman in emphasizing the importance of this program in the war effort. I know there are many small contractors who have been kept in a state of suspense not knowing from one week to the other exactly what the Army proposes to do, many of whom had gone to the bank and borrowed money to carry out their contracts. The Navy did not indulge in this sort of practice.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely right because he knew the condition right along, and I want to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia for what he did in encouraging civilian pilot training in the United States at a time when we needed it. And along with him I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. KERR] and other members of the committee for making civilian pilot training possible in the days when it was difficult to convince people of its great importance. Let me give you one testimonial.

Here is a letter from a civilian pilot training program trainee, which is typical of thousands:

APRIL 6, 1943.

Mr. BUCKMAN,
Civilian Pilot Training Program,
Boeing Field, Seattle, Wash.

DEAR SIR: When I talked to you last fall I thanked you for helping me over the rough spots when I was in civilian pilot training program training. At that time I stressed the usefulness of this training.

In order to illustrate the value of the course offered, I will briefly outline my movements in the Ferry Command.

I joined the Ferry Command on May 1 in Long Beach, Calif. At that time I had about 190 hours, and was checked out in a BT 13A—450 horsepower.

After flying PT's, BT's, and copilot on DC3's, Hudsons, and Venturas for about 70 hours, I was given transition in an A28A-2-1200 H. P. motors.

I was checked out as first pilot on the Hudson when I had 280 hours.

I was checked out in a Ventura-2X2000 H. P. engines—when I had 300 hours.

I was checked out in a B25-2-1750 H. P. motors—when I had 325 hours. I was checked out in an A20-2-1600 H. P. engines—when I had about 395 hours.

I attended an Army instrument school and foreign ferry school at St. Joseph, Mo. I was given my instrument card on a B25 at 415 hours, being checked out by a former airline pilot.

I was given an A20 for foreign ferry and crossed the ocean with 485 hours. The total flight was about 14,000 miles.

I am now being checked out in a B17 with approximately 510 hours.

I was commissioned a second lieutenant after 4 months in the Ferry Command and was raised to a first lieutenant after 3 months because of my twin-engine rating.

I am expecting a captaincy to go with my four-engine rating.

This document is not boasting on my part, as this performance has been duplicated by many other civilian pilot training program students.

I feel that civilian pilot training program students have a better background in fundamentals of flying and in care of aircraft than Army pilots and many old-timers.

We lacked the heavy- and hot-ship time, but we made up for it in navigation and meteorology. I have heard some transition instructors say we were preferred because we were more able to cope with the big ships.

This, I realize, is scant praise for the excellent job you and your organization have done in providing pilots at little cost when they were needed.

Sincerely,

Lt. GORDON E. PROCTOR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I wanted to make sure that the item providing for the airport at Wichita, Kans., is included in this appropriation. It is very much needed and the people in that community are quite anxious about it.

Mr. STEFAN. Wichita, Kans., is included in the 65 airports or D. L. A. project included in this bill. For the information of the Members I will include in the extension of my remarks the locations and States in which these developments of landing areas are included.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate this information. Now, I want to inquire about another and different item, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska with reference to the item for representation which was discussed on the floor of the House a few days ago. I understand this item has been increased since it left the House. It should have been at least decreased. The gentleman will recall we had it stricken out at one time.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Kansas took a great deal of interest in that item and I tried to help him. When it went to conference there was a compromise, and it was cut a little below what the Senate wanted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is still more than the House provided. I regret the other body saw fit to increase it. I do want to commend the distinguished gentleman for his efforts in securing the reduction and saving the taxpayers at least \$5,000. He has done a splendid job and we appreciate it.

Mr. STEFAN. You are correct. We allowed \$210,000; the Senate increased it to \$230,000; the conference committee compromised at \$225,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But it is still \$15,000 more than the House passed.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; it is one of those things on which a compromise had to be reached. The gentleman was very much concerned about it and we took his argument into consideration in the conference.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It seems that my argument was not strong enough or it would not have been increased \$15,000.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's argument received very careful consideration.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. I personally wish to felicitate the gentleman and other members of the conference committee on the statesmanlike job that has been done in considering these additional estimates that have been presented to the Senate as well as those that came to the House committee originally.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman understands that some of these items were not in the House bill originally.

Mr. DIMOND. Yes; I do understand that, but I am particularly grateful because the House confers with respect to the Alaska items as with respect to

these other items that are desired for the war effort had agreed substantially to the Budget estimates. I wish, however, to address a question to the gentleman with respect to the estimates which came to the Senate in the first instance for air facilities in Alaska and for the setting up of a local field office in the Territory of Alaska.

While much of the testimony given before the Senate subcommittee was off the record, on page 244 of the Senate hearings is a break-down of the supplemental Budget estimate for air navigation facilities totaling \$1,842,405, of which all but \$169,600 is for expenditure in Alaska. It is regrettable that these facilities now planned were not put in several years ago, but we are grateful to have them for the future. Many people do not understand the vital necessity to our war effort of having adequate airports and air navigation facilities in Alaska and the almost equal necessity, in support of the war effort, in giving suitable aid to civilian air transport in the Territory. It is to be noted that the civilian air lines operating in Alaska always give priority to military demands upon them, and so they are really serving the Army and Navy, perhaps even better than they could if they were directly under military control. Air navigation facilities now provided in the bill will serve not only military requirements but also civilian needs. The committee is to be commended for taking the trouble to learn the situation and thus support the program.

In the Senate hearings on page 223 is an exposition of the need of a field office for the Civil Aeronautics Board in Alaska. The need for the office is fully set out in the Senate hearings so there is no occasion to repeat here the sound reasons which support it.

As I read the hearings and the conference report the House conferees have agreed to substantially all these estimates that were sent to the Senate. I have here also a telegram from the Governor of Alaska in which he expresses concern about the setting up of the field office in Alaska which we all know is necessary. I think the amount asked for in the estimate is \$32,000 and as I understand this amount has been included in the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; the committee members appreciate the great help given by the Delegate from Alaska. That item was included. The committee realizes the great importance of Alaska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9, page 60, line 6, insert "Civilian pilot training: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in carrying out the duties, powers, and functions devolving upon it pursuant

to the authority contained in the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended (49 U. S. C. 751, 752), and as further amended, but limited to the training of sufficient persons, presently enrolled in the civilian pilot training program, to produce 7,200 instructor-course graduates for the Army, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation when authorized by the Administrator; salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or other agencies serving aviation; purchase, cleaning, and repair of special aviation wearing apparel and parachutes; traveling expenses; not to exceed \$100,000 for the purchase of aircraft for administrative purposes; hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft and passenger-carrying automobiles; pay at a rate of \$50 per month to persons subject to service in the Army of the United States but not on active duty therein, while undergoing training and during one or more periods while awaiting assignment between courses (not exceeding 2 months between any two courses) pursuant to the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended, travel and subsistence of trainees, \$33,940,358: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$441,000 of this amount may be transferred to the appropriation 'Enforcement of safety regulations, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics,' for expenditure in connection with payment of salaries and travel of personnel engaged in supervision and promotion of the safety features of the civilian pilot training program, and not to exceed \$258,662 may be transferred to the appropriation 'General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics,' for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the program: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available after September 1, 1943, to pay any member of the enlisted reserve on inactive status."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and agree to the same with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$33,940,358" in such amendment insert "\$29,400,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, a word of explanation about the amendment. The Budget estimate for this item was \$27,874,000. The Senate originally allowed and increased the item to \$33,940,358. That was a temporary action on the part of the Senate, pending receipt of additional data. Subsequently, they received from the Bureau of the Budget a revised estimate for this activity of \$29,339,533 and that was increased and allowed in conference in the sum of \$29,400,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, line 1, insert "Development of landing areas: The consolidated appropriation under this head in the Department of

Commerce Appropriation Act, 1943, shall remain available until June 30, 1944, without warrant action: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$158,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics,' for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the development of landing areas program."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the Senate, insert the following paragraph:

"The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained in this act shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this is a clarifying amendment and makes the funds retroactive to July 1 should the bill not be signed until after that date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

HON. JESSE JONES

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, we are passing through an era when criticism is the order of the day. The restrictions under which we must all live have caused many people to attack policies and people more in irritation than in justice. Records of distinguished public service have been ignored and forgotten. Brickbats are thrown where praise should be bestowed.

An outstanding example of a man who has served his country only to be rewarded by unjust criticism, often malicious, is Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce. For more than 11 years, Mr. Jones—first as a director of the R. F. C., then as Chairman of that Board, as Federal Loan Administrator, and as Secretary of Commerce—has given unselfish and devoted service to the Nation.

He was the man who rebuilt the banking structure of the United States after its collapse in 1932. He was the man who revitalized the railroads of this country. He was the man who restored the economic vitality of our business structure. He did this without playing politics and in such a businesslike way that the operations of the R. F. C.—prior to our entry in the war—were conducted at no cost to the Government and with a surplus more than sufficient to take care of all possible losses.

If Mr. Jones, as a public servant, had done nothing else, he would deserve the praise and gratitude of every citizen.

When the United States initiated its national-defense program, Mr. Jones immediately brought the agencies under his jurisdiction into step with our preparedness and war effort.

The activities of the various loan agencies under his control have been of untold assistance to our military effort. Because Mr. Jones was a businessman, he has been able to enlist the aid of businessmen throughout the country.

He and his associates have authorized the use of more than \$20,000,000,000 in the war program. They have built and expanded facilities, acquired critical and strategic materials—whenever they were needed by the armed services or the production agencies of this Government.

Critics have attempted to belittle Mr. Jones' part in the war effort. Invariably they have spoken either from ignorance or malice. He has been attacked because he has proceeded along businesslike lines to do the tasks that were assigned to him. The United States could well afford to have more men with his knowledge and experience in high places, for I certainly regard it as no crime to have in government a man who seeks to protect the interest of his country and its citizens.

It would have been easy for Mr. Jones to have been less conscientious and painstaking. It takes no skill to waste the people's money. It takes no training to neglect the people's interest.

When the history of this period is surveyed by the calm judgment of future historians, it is my certain belief that the record of Jesse Jones as a public servant will shine as a bright light. Those who now criticize him, either from selfish motives or because he refuses to yield an inch from what his conscience tells him is the right and proper thing to do, will leave no stains upon his record.

It is my sincere conviction that men who have given as much of themselves to their country as Jesse Jones has done should be praised, and I am happy to be in a position today to raise my voice to extoll such services in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report and the several amendments were agreed to and I ask unanimous consent that that motion be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

PETROLEUM COMMITTEE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Petroleum Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia

and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 14, 15, 17, 22, 40 and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, and 69; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$95,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$80,676"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$122,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,840,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$977,107"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$237,610"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$145,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$261,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, and after the comma, strike out the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Number 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$244,360"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 25, 27, 32, 45, 57, 58, 59, 63, 70, and 72.

GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN M. COFFEE,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
KARL STEFAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 1, relating to the Department of Inspections: Provides for the amount proposed by the Senate, \$279,040, in lieu of \$274,280 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2, relating to the Auditor's Office: Provides for \$153,010 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of \$145,810 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3, relating to expenses of weights, measures, and markets: Deletes the words "including exchange", thus providing the office with an additional car.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6, relating to the Public Utilities Commission: The one corrects punctuation and the other provides for personal services \$95,200 in lieu of \$97,700 as proposed by the Senate and \$85,400 as proposed by the House. The amount agreed upon will provide for the following items not contained in the House bill: One engineer, P-4; one inspector, SP-6; one accounting and auditing assistant, CAF-5; and clerical and contingent expenses for the People's Counsel, \$2,000.

The position of engineer P-4, above noted, is allowed with the understanding that the position, which is currently provided for and at present vacant, will be filled on a temporary basis so that the creation of a new position will not be necessitated, if and when the last incumbent returns from military service.

Amendment No. 7, relating to the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board: The proposal of the Senate is agreed to, which provides \$36,630 in lieu of \$33,365.

Amendment No. 8, relating to the Zoning Commission: Provides for \$12,720 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of \$9,280 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9, relating to personal services of the Office of Register of Wills: Provides for \$80,676 in lieu of \$83,556 as proposed by the Senate, and \$79,056 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10, relating to personal services of the Office of the Recorder of Deeds: Provides for \$122,730 in lieu of \$127,800 as proposed by the Senate and \$116,730 as proposed by the House.

CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Amendment No. 11, relating to judicial expenses: Inserts the Senate language, which allows expenses to be incurred in cases before the United States Court of Appeals and the courts of the District of Columbia. This language clarifies the purpose of the appropriation in view of the judicial set-up within the District of Columbia.

Amendment No. 12, relating to general advertising: Adopts the Senate's proposed language clarifying the purposes for which the appropriation may be used.

Amendment No. 13, relating to printing and binding: Provides for \$63,885 as proposed by the House in lieu of \$65,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15, relating to the Central Garage: Provide for \$1,950 for an automobile for the executive office in lieu of \$2,650 as proposed by the Senate and corrects the total accordingly.

Amendment No. 16, relating to Central Control of Emergency Ambulance Service: Provides for \$12,000 for this purpose as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17, relating to the refund of erroneous collections: Provides for \$100,000 as proposed by the House in lieu of \$75,000 as provided by the Senate.

FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY

Amendment No. 18, relating to personal services: Provides for \$495,036 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of \$489,096 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19, relating to maintenance, alterations, etc.: Provides \$43,225 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of \$49,875 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20, relating to the reappropriation of funds now available, not in excess of \$7,000, for new central building of the Public Library: The House accepts the Senate language.

SEWERS

Amendment No. 21, relating to sewers and receiving basins: The House accepts the language inserted by the Senate which reappropriates unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations.

Amendment No. 22, relating to rental of storage property for construction materials: The Senate recedes from its amendment appropriating \$15,000 for this purpose.

COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL OF REFUSE

Amendment No. 23, relating to street cleaning: Provides for \$713,900 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of \$543,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24, relating to garbage disposal: Provides for \$1,453,400 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of \$1,168,400 as proposed by the House.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Amendment No. 26, relating to general supervision and instruction: Provides for \$8,840,400 in lieu of \$8,898,000 as provided by the Senate and \$8,801,150 as proposed by the House. In arriving at this compromise, \$29,650 for physical education textbooks, equipment, etc., and \$9,600 for 3 assistant principals are added to the House proposal.

Amendment No. 28, relating to science laboratories: The House agrees to the Senate proposal reappropriating unexpended balances for this purpose.

Amendment No. 29, relating to plans and specifications for building construction: Accedes to the Senate clarification of House language regarding such construction.

RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 30, relating to salaries and expenses: Accedes to the Senate figure of \$496,118 in lieu of the House proposal, \$416,760.

Amendment No. 31, relating to medical services: Accepts the Senate language for housekeeping assistance in cases of authentic indigent sick. In agreeing to the program, it is understood by the managers on the part of the House and the Senate that the furnishing of such housekeeping assistance is to be continued only as a temporary program during fiscal year 1944.

Amendment No. 33, relating to inspections: Provides for \$214,202 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of \$208,602 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Accepts Senate proposal for repairs, alterations, etc., to Henry School in order to adapt it for health center and for expenses of operation and maintenance of same. The former amount is \$15,000 and the latter \$6,120.

Amendment No. 36, relating to repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds of the Glenn Dale Sanatorium: Provides for Senate amount of \$12,630 in lieu of House figure of \$10,230, and reappropriates \$5,100 of unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations.

Amendment No. 37: Reappropriates \$10,000 of the unexpended balances of appropriations for repairs, alterations, etc., to the Tuberculosis Hospital at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW.

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, 40, and 41, relating to personal services, Gallinger Hospital: No. 38 changes name of physicians resident at the hospital; No. 39 adopts the Senate proposal of fixing the salaries of certain such medical officers at \$6,000; No. 40 retains the House proposal for salaries of other such medical officers at \$3,200; and No. 41 provides for a total of \$977,107 in lieu of the Senate proposal of \$985,107 and the House proposal of \$974,707.

Amendment No. 42, relating to repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds at Gallinger Hospital: Reappropriates funds presently available and unexpended for this purpose in addition to the direct appropriation.

Amendment No. 43, relating to Washington Home for Incurables: Accedes to the Senate proposal of \$19,500 in lieu of the House proposal of \$15,000.

COURTS

Amendment No. 44, relating to the juvenile court: Adopts the Senate proposal of \$121,595 in lieu of the House proposal of \$120,175.

Amendment No. 46, relating to personal services, municipal court for the District of Columbia: Provides for \$237,610 in lieu of the Senate proposal of \$240,850 and the House proposal of \$234,190. This provides for one probation officer at \$1,800 and one stenographer at \$1,620 to be added to the House provision.

Amendment No. 47, relating to the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia: Accedes to the Senate proposal of \$54,443 in lieu of the House figure of \$52,510.

PROBATION SYSTEM

Amendments Nos. 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52: Amendments Nos. 48, 49, and 50 clarify title of the appropriation. Amendments Nos. 51 and 52 increase by \$4,440 the amount of the House proposal for personal services and correct the total for the probation system accordingly.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Amendment No. 53, relating to Board of Public Welfare: Provides for the Senate figure of \$203,280 in lieu of the House proposal, \$185,540.

Amendment No. 54, relating to board and care of children committed: Reduces the

House proposal of \$305,000 to the Senate proposal of \$286,000 and provides for the reappropriation of unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations.

Amendment No. 55, relating to personal services, jail: Provides for \$145,750 in lieu of the Senate proposal of \$149,230 and the House proposal of \$142,750. This compromise adds the salaries of two guards at \$1,500 to the House figure.

Amendment No. 56, relating to personal services, Workhouse and Reformatory: Provides for the Senate proposal of \$641,344 in lieu of \$637,544, the House proposal.

Amendment No. 60, relating to the Industrial Home School: Provides for the Senate proposal of \$20,000 instead of the House figure, \$5,000, which increase is to be used for the repairs and improvements to the buildings now occupied by the National Training School for Girls.

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62, relating to the Home for the Aged and Infirm, salaries: The House accedes to the Senate increase for personal services of \$3,600.

Amendments Nos. 63, 64, and 65, relating to public assistance: Provides as proposed by the Senate for a limitation of \$73,170 on the amount to be expended for personal services; appropriates \$261,740 in lieu of \$450,000 as proposed by the House and \$286,740 as proposed by the Senate; and, in addition, accepts the Senate language reappropriating unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations; accepts the Senate proposal providing for the burial of indigent persons and certification of persons eligible for public benefits.

Amendment No. 66, relating to home care for dependent children: Provides for the Senate figure of \$243,400 in lieu of \$298,400 as proposed by the House and accepts the Senate recommendation for a reappropriation of unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations.

Amendment No. 67, relating to assistance against old-age want: Provides for the Senate amount, \$635,465, in lieu of \$685,465 as proposed by the House, and accepts the Senate recommendation for the reappropriation of unexpended balances of 1943 appropriations.

Amendment No. 69: Provides for a change of date in correction of clerical error.

Amendment No. 71: The Senate recedes from the appropriation of \$10,500 proposed for the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency.

Amendment No. 73, relating to personal services, water department: Provides for \$244,360 in lieu of \$244,860 as proposed by the Senate and \$239,760 as proposed by the House. A new position of Registrar, at \$4,600, was added to the House figure. The District Commissioners are expected by both committees to conduct an independent investigation of the entire water system of the District of Columbia and of the report made thereon by the General Accounting Office.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The conferees have not agreed with respect to the following Senate amendments:

Amendment No. 4, relating to advancements to the Superintendent of Weights and Measures and Markets for use in connection with investigations. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Amendment No. 25, relating to salary schedule of the Acting Superintendent of Schools during the absence of the Superintendent. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 27, relating to assignment of certain teachers to pupil guidance. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 32, relating to amount of appropriation for medical services. The managers on the part of the House will offer

a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment increasing the Senate figure to \$755,760.

Amendment No. 45, relating to detailing of psychiatric services by the Public Health Service to the juvenile court. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 57, relating to acquisition of land for Workhouse and Reformatory. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendments Nos. 58 and 59, relating to the acquisition of land and construction of temporary buildings for the National Training School for Girls. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendments.

Amendment No. 68, relating to the penny-milk program for the school children of the District of Columbia and the supervision of Victory gardens, etc. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 70, relating to the settlement of claims of the District of Columbia against the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 72, relating to construction of a covered reservoir adjacent to the McMillan filter plant and the increase in authority therefor. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN M. COFFEE,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
KARL STEFAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year which is soon to begin.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia began hearings on this bill on March 16, the bill was submitted to the House and passed the House on the 20th of April, and carried an appropriation of something less than \$55,000,000.

The bill went to the Senate and passed the Senate sometime ago. We have worked out in conference with the Senate a complete agreement with respect to all portions of the bill. We have worked out what we think is, on the whole, a fairly satisfactory bill. The Senate made certain increases in the bill totaling about \$1,000,000. Some of those increases can be explained by reason of the fact that after the bill went to the Senate certain additional Budget estimates were presented. On the whole the bill was not greatly changed by the action of the other body.

There have been a number of minor features added in the bill, for example, housekeeping aides in the Health Department, some additional money for the schools, and some additional money for the sewer system and for the refuse department, but, on the whole, no very material changes were made.

If there are no questions, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to consume 5 minutes on a bill which

has been fully explained to the House. We are fully agreed. As the distinguished chairman of our committee informed the House, this is the result of a conference with the Senate, and an agreement has been reached. I feel that in this bill the District has been amply provided for as far as those needs for which justifications had been made to us by the various agencies of the District. As the war continues and Washington becomes more and more important as the world headquarters for a world at war, changes will continually be made and new facilities and additional requests will be made of Congress. I think that those new requests should come to us in the form of deficiency bills as emergencies arise. However, with the information we had up to the time we met with the Senate, I believe that everything within reason has been provided for the District that was requested of us by the Commissioners and the various citizens' associations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier today on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, H. R. 2397, and include therein a telegram or excerpts therefrom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in connection with the conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill and to include therein a letter and a table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the Pennsylvania oil fields where I talked to both producers and refiners. They tell me that there is approximately 5,000 wells in the field not being pumped. Leases are being scrapped and the casing from the wells sold for junk.

They also tell me that with a 50- to 75-cent increased price on a barrel of crude oil that they can increase production approximately 15,000 barrels a day. They would start to drill approximately 500 new wells and all the old wells would be put back on the pump.

There is an estimated potential volume of 900,000,000 barrels of oil on the western edge of this eastern market which is so sorely in need of gasoline. A 50 to 75 cents a barrel increase on oil would mean less than one-half cent a gallon on refined products. By that, I mean, lubricating oil, gasoline, benzene, naphtha, and so forth.

Let me advise you that approximately 40 to 50 percent of a barrel of crude oil is gasoline. If we can increase production in the Pennsylvania fields 15,000 barrels a day it would mean 7,500 barrels of gasoline, at 42 gallons to a barrel, or 315,000 gallons a day; or in a period of a month they could produce over 9,000,000 gallons of gasoline to afford relief to millions of gasoline hungry people in the highly populated area throughout the eastern section of the United States who are crying for relief. In the name of common sense let us wake up this O. P. A. outfit, or kick them out.

Oil today is at 60 percent parity and the impractical visionaries in the Office of Price Administration have determined to hold the line. Deputy Administrator Sumner Pike is responsible for this hold the line action, that is causing the serious oil and gasoline shortage in America. He is one of the new school of thought intellectuals who has been loaned to Administrator Prentiss Brown.

I do not know how much interest Administrator Brown is paying on the loan, but if I were he, I would discount this loan of Sumner Pike and pay it off and shoot him back to the Securities Exchange Commission from where he originally came. It would be helpful to millions of suffering motorists.

The people of America are crying for gasoline and it seems that we in the Congress should demand that something be done. We know where the oil can be gotten almost immediately to secure the gasoline to afford relief. Why do we tolerate conditions such as exist here in Washington today? Why do we tolerate Sumner Pike?

The oil man wants no subsidies which they are pushing at him. All he wants is a fair price for his oil and he will get the oil which will, I am certain, bring relief to millions of people throughout the East who are begging for gasoline.

Give the Pennsylvania grade crude-oil industry the job to do, a price to insure lifting costs for oil, and they will produce the oil that will produce the gasoline so business, industry, labor, and the farmer can operate in a normal manner.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. Does the gentleman think it is necessary to increase the price for that oil which is now being pumped and on which the companies or organizations operating are now making a profit in order to get the increased production from wells which have stopped producing, according to the gentleman's testimony? Does not the gentleman agree that if that new production is necessary it would be cheaper for all concerned to pay subsidies on the production from the wells he proposes to make active?

Mr. GAVIN. The people to whom I am referring are not companies, they are small independent producers. There are thousands of them in the Pennsylvania fields who have been on a starvation diet for the past 10 years. They have leases. They pump the oil and they sell

to the oil companies. The oil companies have marketing outlets, retail outlets, and Government contracts. The producers are not making money. But when they cannot get the lifting cost for the oil they abandon the wells and refuse to pump them and the oil is lost when it is needed for gasoline. The oil is in the earth. Approximately 900,000,000 barrels of oil are down in the Pennsylvania sands waiting to be coaxed up out of the earth; when the producers get a price commensurate with the cost to do the job these men will get the oil and the public will get the gasoline. Until such a price increase is granted, they cannot get the oil because of increased material costs and increased labor costs. The price of oil has been static since October 1941. The result is that the industry is dormant, production is decreasing, and the people are going hungry for gasoline.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Wichita Beacon of Wichita, Kans., under date of June 20, relative to the Lea-Bailey bill on aviation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], who has just spoken on the oil shortage in the Eastern States, I call attention to the fact that these Representatives along the eastern seaboard are as much responsible for that condition as anybody else in the world. The oil production in Pennsylvania is only 47,000 barrels a day. The oil production in Michigan is only 47,000 barrels a day.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman's figures are wrong.

Mr. RANKIN. My figures are correct. I have checked them. That is the testimony given before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors by the people who know the oil production in the United States.

We are short around 600,000 barrels a day in the Eastern States. If the Members along the Atlantic seaboard had not helped to kill the appropriation for the construction of that short link of the intercoastal canal across the Florida Peninsula, they would soon be getting all the oil and gasoline they need. So why get up here now and say that it is necessary to drill more oil wells in Pennsylvania when we have all of the oil and gas we need, but we need some method of transportation to get it to the Atlantic seaboard, and the very ones who are com-

plaining are preventing the construction of those methods of transportation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Can the gentleman tell me how the Florida ship canal would put gasoline into the motorists' tanks right now? It would take 3 years to do that job.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is 6 months late and 6 months early. If he had joined with us a year ago we would have had the canal practically completed.

Mr. GAVIN. I was not here a year ago.

Mr. RANKIN. You will be crying a year from now just as badly as you are today, because you will have everybody up and down the Atlantic seaboard on your necks for not having provided the means for bringing oil and gasoline to the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. GAVIN. They are not my necks. I am trying to secure relief for the long-suffering American people.

Let me explain this to the gentleman in just a minute. We have the oil. Fifty percent of a barrel of crude oil is gasoline. We can increase the production 15,000 barrels a day to take care of these people on the eastern seaboard.

Mr. RANKIN. But 15,000 barrels of oil a day increase would be just like giving it to them with a medicine dropper. What you need is an additional 600,000 barrels a day. In order to get that to supply the Atlantic seaboard with oil and gasoline, you will have to have the canal completed across the Florida Peninsula or else you are going to be in a worse condition a year from now than you are today, if the war continues.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I hate to disagree with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, but all the transportation facilities in the world, the ships, and the Florida ship canal or anything else, is not going to get oil 6 months from now—

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I know the gentleman has fought this bill for 2 years, but 8 months from today, 9 months from today, a year and a half from today, you will all be singing the same song, and if you had not voted against this proposition all along you would have had oil today. They are undertaking now to pipe oil out of Oklahoma a long distance through a pipe line which will not send more than 250,000 barrels a day at the best, even if your 24-inch pipe line holds, which I seriously doubt. No such line ever has held any great length of time. And there is a very grave question whether or not this one will hold, and when you join with these enemies of the Florida ship canal along the Atlantic seaboard, you help to shut the door of hope in the faces of the people in the Atlantic States for an adequate supply of gasoline and oil.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I suggest to the gentleman there is a lot in what he says, but I can suggest a way that we can get oil and gas, and that is to grant the request for an adequate rise in the price of oil.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman has some bootstrap substitute to offer, I prefer that he offer it in his own time.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman is right about the Florida ship canal, but does not the same thing apply to the St. Lawrence waterway? If we had that bill, we would have been able to get lots of oil from the Middle West.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes, and these same people along the Atlantic seacoast shot the bottom out of their own boat by opposing the St. Lawrence project. Not only that, but they denied to the people of the northeastern States the use of 10,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity a year, which that great project would have provided.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 4: Page 5, line 19, insert "Provided, That the Disbursing Officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the Superintendent of the Department of Weights, Measures, and Markets, upon requisition previously approved by the Auditor of the District of Columbia, sums of money, not exceeding \$100 at any one time, to be used exclusively in connection with investigations and detection of short weights and measures, and to be accounted for monthly on itemized vouchers to the accounting officials of the District of Columbia."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the amendment, change the period to a colon and add "Provided further, That the appropriations and authority contained in this act shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority: And provided further, That all obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment numbered 4 simply provides that the Superintendent of the Departments of Weights, Measures, and Markets may be provided by the auditor of the District of Columbia with a small sum of money to enable him to more effectively carry on the duties of his office. The amendment that I offer is an amend-

ment that is being offered to all of these appropriation bills, providing for the validation of expenditures for the interim, if there be any, between the time this bill becomes the law, and the first day of July.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 23, line 18, after the word "available", insert "Provided, That the Board of Education is authorized to assign the Acting Superintendent of Schools to the salary schedule for the Superintendent of Schools, contained in the Teachers' Salary Act of 1924, during the time the said Superintendent is granted leave of absence without pay by the Board of Education, and this appropriation shall be available for payment on that basis of the salary of the Acting Superintendent."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: After the word "activities", page 24, line 18, insert the following: "Provided further, That from the funds provided for salaries of teachers in the District of Columbia public schools the Board of Education is authorized to pay the salaries of such teachers, not to exceed one in each junior high school and one in each elementary school, as may be assigned, at a grade not higher than P-3, to supervisory duties in connection with pupil guidance."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 32, line 4, strike out "\$708,375" and insert "\$754,820."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same with an amendment: In lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senate, insert "\$755,760."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides an additional sum for the health department. It provides for \$940 for traveling expenses here in the District of Columbia, in connection with the work of the health department.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 42, line 11, insert "The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to obtain psychiatric service for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia from the United States Public Health Service, and, at the request of the Board of Commissioners, the Surgeon General is authorized to detail the necessary medical and other personnel, not to exceed one psychiatrist, one psychologist, and one nurse, for this purpose."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 45 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 57: Page 48, line 18, insert: "For an additional amount for the acquisition by the Commissioners of additional land for the workhouse and reformatory, \$750, and the appropriation of \$25,000 for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1913, shall continue available in the fiscal year 1944: Provided, That the title to said property shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, and in case a clear title cannot be assured through conveyance the Attorney General of the United States, at the request of the Commissioners, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such land as may be selected in the State of Virginia in accordance with the laws of said State, and not to exceed \$750 shall be available for expenses of procuring evidences of title or of condemnation, or both."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 58: Page 51, line 3, insert: "For the acquisition of a site in Maryland for the National Training School for Girls, including the preparation of plans for permanent buildings and traveling expenses, \$42,000: Provided, That title to said property shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, and in case a satisfactory price cannot be agreed upon for the purchase of said property, the Attorney General of the United States at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such property as may be selected in accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland, and expenses of procuring evidences of title or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of said appropriation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 58 and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 59: Page 51, line 16, insert: "For the construction of temporary buildings for the National Training School for Girls on a new site to be acquired in Maryland, including furniture and equipment, \$40,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 59.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 68: Page 56, line 16, insert: "For necessary expenses, including personal services without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the carrying out, under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissions of the District of Columbia, of a 'penny milk' program for the school children of the District, including the purchase and distribution of milk under agreements with the United States Department of Agriculture, and for the carrying out of a food-conservation program in the District of Columbia, including the supervision of 'Victory' gardens and the canning of the products thereof, \$75,000: Provided, That collections from the milk program shall be paid to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District, and that reimbursement for such canning shall be in kind and for the benefit of public-welfare institutions of the District of Columbia."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 68.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follow:

Amendment No. 70: Page 74, line 4, insert "The Commissioners are hereby authorized to settle the claim of the District of Columbia against the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., growing out of the construction of the Franklin Street Bridge and approaches, in the amount of \$47,177.05, for the sum of \$32,279.83; and the Commissioners are further authorized to settle the claim of the District of Columbia against the said company, growing out of the construction of the Eastern Avenue Bridge and approaches, in the amount of \$13,684.14, for the sum of \$10,999.45."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 70 and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 72: Page 78, line 20, insert "For an additional amount for the construction of a covered reservoir of approximately 20,000,000-gallon capacity on United States Government-owned land adjacent to the present filtered-water reservoir of the McMillan filter plant, with all necessary appurtenances and auxiliaries, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, \$69,500, to continue available until expended, and the authorized limit of cost of the said reservoir, appurtenances, and auxiliaries is hereby increased from \$620,000 to \$689,500."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 72 and agree to the same with an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 72 and agree to the same with an

amendment as follows: After "\$69,500" strike out "to continue available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the various votes will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 647) to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LeCOMPTE.

CONVEYANCE OF PUBLIC LANDS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA FOR RECREA- TIONAL AND WILDLIFE PURPOSES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 629) to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes, insist on the amendments of the House to the said bill, and agree to the conference asked.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LeCOMPTE.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Thursday, after the disposition of business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADE-MARKS USED IN COMMERCE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 82), to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the legislation?

Mr. LANHAM. I shall be glad to. This bill in its present terms and provisions was passed by the House in the last Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no difference between this bill and the bill previously passed by the House?

Mr. LANHAM. Except that we have added to this bill three amendments which the Senate committee had recommended. The bill did not come up in the Senate until the last day and in the final rush of legislative work it was not passed. Any further necessary hearings will be held before the Senate committee. We have been working on this for about 4 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are the other amendments that the Senate is going to consider viewed favorably by your committee?

Mr. LANHAM. The three Senate amendments included in this bill are entirely favorable to our committee. Representatives of our committee attended those hearings.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And this is a unanimous report of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. LANHAM. It is.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—THE PRINCIPAL REGISTER

SECTION 1. The owner of a trade-mark used in commerce may register his trade-mark under this act on the principal register hereby established:

(a) By filing in the Patent Office—

(1) a written application, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, verified by the applicant, or by a member of the firm or an officer of the corporation or association applying, specifying applicant's domicile and citizenship, the date of applicant's first use of the mark, the date of applicant's first use of the mark in commerce, the goods in connection with which the mark is used and the mode or manner in which the mark is used in connection with such goods, and including a statement to the effect that the person making the verification believes himself, or the firm, corporation, or association in whose behalf he makes the verification, to be the owner of the mark sought to be registered, that the mark is in use in commerce, and that no other person, firm, corporation, or association, to the best of his knowledge and belief, has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as might be calculated to deceive: *Provided*, That in the case of every application claiming concurrent use the applicant shall state exceptions to his claim of exclusive use, in which he shall specify, to the extent of his knowledge, any concurrent use by others, the goods or services in connection with which and the areas in which each concurrent use exists, the periods of each use, and the goods and area for which the applicant desires registration;

(2) a drawing of the mark; and

(3) such number of specimens or facsimiles of the mark as actually used as may be required by the Commissioner.

(b) By paying into the Patent Office the filing fee.

(c) By complying with such rules or regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

(d) If the applicant is not domiciled in the United States he shall designate by a written document filed in the Patent Office the name and address of some person resident in the

United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with him or mailing to him a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.

MARKS REGISTRABLE ON THE PRINCIPAL REGISTER

SEC. 2. No trade-mark by which the goods of the applicant may be distinguished from the goods of others shall be refused registration on the principal register on account of its nature unless it—

(a) Consists of or comprises immoral, deceptive, or scandalous matter; or matter which may disparage or falsely suggest a connection with persons, living or dead, institutions, beliefs, or national symbols, or bring them into contempt, or disrepute.

(b) Consists of or comprises the flag or coat of arms or other insignia of the United States, or of any State or municipality, or of any foreign nation, or any simulation thereof.

(c) Consists of or comprises a name, portrait, or signature identifying a particular living individual except by his written consent, or the name, signature, or portrait of a deceased President of the United States during the life of his widow, if any, except by the written consent of the widow.

(d) Consists of or comprises a mark which so resembles a mark registered in the Patent Office or a mark or trade name previously used in the United States by another and not abandoned, as to be likely, when applied to the goods of the applicant, to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers: *Provided*, That the Commissioner may register as concurrent registrations the same or similar marks to more than one registrant when they have become entitled to use such marks as a result of their concurrent lawful use thereof in commerce prior to any of the filing dates of the applications involved and the Commissioner or a court on appeal determines that confusion or mistake or deceit of purchasers is not likely to result from the continued use of said marks under conditions and limitations as to the mode or place of use of the goods in connection with which such registrations may be granted which conditions and limitations shall be prescribed in the grant of the concurrent registrations thereof; and concurrent registrations may be similarly granted by the Commissioner with such conditions and limitations when a court has finally determined that more than one person is entitled to use the same or similar marks in commerce. The Commissioner shall give not less than 30 days' written notice to all applicants, registrants, and users specified by any of the parties concerned of any application for concurrent registration and of the time and place of the hearings thereon. When the Commissioner decides to grant a concurrent registration the proposed registration shall be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office and the application shall be subject to opposition as hereinafter provided for other applications to register marks. Concurrent registrations may be ordered by a court in an action under the provisions of section 4915, Revised Statutes, under such conditions and limitations as the court considers proper in accordance herewith.

(e) Consists of a mark which, (1) when applied to the goods of the applicant is merely descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive of them, or (2) when applied to the goods of the applicant is primarily geographically descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive of them, except as indications of regional origin may be registrable under section 4 hereof, or (3) is primarily merely a surname.

(f) Except as expressly excluded in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section,

nothing herein shall prevent the registration of a mark used by the applicant which has become distinctive of the applicant's goods in commerce. The Commissioner may accept as prima facie evidence that the mark has become distinctive, as applied to the applicant's goods in commerce, proof of substantially exclusive and continuous use thereof as a mark by the applicant in commerce for the 5 years next preceding the date of the filing of the application for its registration.

SERVICE MARKS REGISTRABLE

Sec. 3. Subject to the provisions relating to the registration of trade-marks, so far as they are applicable, service marks used in commerce shall be registrable, in the same manner and with the same effect as are trade-marks, and when registered they shall be entitled to the protection provided herein in the case of trade-marks, except when used so as to represent falsely that the owner thereof makes or sells the goods on which such mark is used. The Commissioner may establish a separate register for such service marks. Applications and procedure under this section shall conform as nearly as practicable to those prescribed for the registration of trade-marks.

COLLECTIVE AND CERTIFICATION MARKS REGISTRABLE

Sec. 4. Subject to the provisions relating to the registration of trade-marks, so far as they are applicable, collective and certification marks, including indications of regional origin used in commerce, shall be registrable under this act, in the same manner and with the same effect as are trade-marks, by persons, and nations, States, municipalities, and the like, exercising legitimate control over the use of the marks sought to be registered, even though not possessing an industrial or commercial establishment, and when registered they shall be entitled to the protection provided herein in the case of trade-marks, except when used so as to represent falsely that the owner or a user thereof makes or sells the goods or performs the services on or in connection with which such mark is used. The Commissioner may establish a separate register for such collective marks and certification marks. Applications and procedure under this section shall conform as nearly as practicable to those prescribed for the registration of trade-marks.

USE BY RELATED COMPANIES

Sec. 5. Where a registered mark or a mark sought to be registered is or may be used by related companies, such use shall inure to the benefit of the registrant or applicant for registration, and such use shall not affect the validity of such mark or of its registration, provided such mark is not used in such manner as to deceive the public.

DISCLAIMERS

Sec. 6. The Commissioner shall require unregistrable matter to be disclaimed, but such disclaimer shall not prejudice or affect the applicant's or owner's rights then existing or thereafter arising in the disclaimed matter, nor shall such disclaimer prejudice or affect the applicant's or owner's rights of registration on another application of later date if the disclaimed matter has become distinctive of the applicant's or owner's goods or services.

CERTIFICATES

Sec. 7. (a) Certificates of registration of marks registered upon the principal register shall be issued in the name of the United States of America, under the seal of the Patent Office, and shall either be signed by the Commissioner or have his name printed thereon and attested by an assistant commissioner or by one of the law examiners duly designated by the Commissioner, and a record thereof, together with printed copies of the drawing and statement of the applicant, shall be kept in books for that

purpose. The certificate shall reproduce the drawing of the mark, contain the statement of the applicant and state that the mark is registered on the principal register under this act, the date of the first use of the mark, the date of the first use of the mark in commerce, the particular goods or services for which it is registered, the number and date of the registration, the term thereof, the date on which the application for registration was received in the Patent Office, and any conditions and limitations that may be imposed in the grant of the registration.

(b) A certificate of registration of a mark upon the principal register provided by this act shall be prima facie evidence of the validity of the registration, registrant's ownership of the mark, and of registrant's exclusive right to use the mark in commerce in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate, subject to any conditions and limitations stated therein.

(c) A certificate of registration of a mark may be issued to the assignee of the applicant, but the assignment must first be recorded in the Patent Office. In case of change of ownership the Commissioner shall, at the request of the owner and upon a proper showing and the payment of the fee herein provided, issue to such assignee a new certificate of registration of the said mark in the name of such assignee, and for the unexpired part of the original period.

(d) At any time, upon application of the registrant and payment of the fee herein provided, the Commissioner may permit any registration in the Patent Office to be surrendered, canceled, or for good cause to be amended, and he may permit any registered mark to be disclaimed in whole or in part: *Provided*, That the registration when so amended shall still contain registrable matter and the mark as amended shall still be registrable as a whole, and that such amendment or disclaimer does not involve such changes in the registration as to alter materially the character of the mark. The Commissioner shall make appropriate entry upon the records of the Patent Office and upon the certificate of registration or, if said certificate is lost or destroyed, upon a certified copy thereof.

(e) Copies of any records, books, papers, or drawings belonging to the Patent Office relating to marks, and copies of certificates of registration, when authenticated by the seal of the Patent Office and certified by the Commissioner, or in his name by a chief of division duly designated by the Commissioner, shall be evidence in all cases wherein the originals would be evidence; and any person making application therefor and paying the fee required by law shall have such copies.

(f) Whenever a material mistake in a registration, incurred through the fault of the Patent Office, is clearly disclosed by the records of the Office a certificate stating the fact and nature of such mistake, signed by the Commissioner and sealed with the seal of the Patent Office, shall be issued without charge and recorded and a printed copy thereof shall be attached to each printed copy of the registration certificate and such corrected certificate shall thereafter have the same effect as if the same had been originally issued in such corrected form, or in the discretion of the Commissioner a new certificate of registration may be issued without charge. All certificates of correction heretofore issued in accordance with the rules of the Patent Office and the registrations to which they are attached shall have the same force and effect as if such certificates and their issue had been specifically authorized by statute.

(g) Whenever a mistake has been made in a registration and a showing has been made that such mistake occurred in good faith through the fault of the applicant, the Com-

missioner is authorized to issue a certificate of correction or, in his discretion, a new certificate upon the payment of the required fee: *Provided*, That the correction does not involve such changes in the registration as to require republication of the mark.

DURATION

Sec. 8. (a) Each certificate of registration shall remain in force for 20 years: *Provided*, That the registration of any mark under the provisions of this act shall be canceled by the Commissioner at the end of 6 years following its date, unless within 1 year next preceding the expiration of such 6 years the registrant shall file in the Patent Office an affidavit showing that said mark is still in use or showing that its nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark. Special notice of the requirement for such affidavit shall be attached to each certificate of registration.

(b) Any registration published under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 12 of this act shall be canceled by the Commissioner at the end of 6 years after the date of such publication unless within 1 year next preceding the expiration of such 6 years the registrant shall file in the Patent Office an affidavit showing that said mark is still in use or showing that its nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark.

(c) The Commissioner shall notify any registrant who files either of the above-prescribed affidavits of his acceptance or refusal thereof and, if a refusal, the reasons therefor.

RENEWAL

Sec. 9. Each registration may be renewed for periods of 20 years from the end of the expiring period upon the filing of an application therefor accompanied by an affidavit by the registrant stating that the mark is still in use in commerce and the payment of the renewal fee required by this act; and such application may be made at any time within 6 months before the expiration of the period for which the certificate of registration was issued or renewed, or it may be made within 3 months after such expiration on payment of the additional fee herein provided.

An applicant for renewal not domiciled in the United States shall be subject to and comply with the provisions of section 1 (d) hereof.

ASSIGNMENT

Sec. 10. A registered mark or a mark for which application to register has been filed shall be assignable with the goodwill of the business in which the mark is used, or with that part of the goodwill of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by the mark, and in any such assignment it shall not be necessary to include the goodwill of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by any other mark used in the business or by the name or style under which the business is conducted: *Provided*, That any assigned registration may be canceled at any time if the registered mark is being used by, or with the permission of, the assignee so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used. Assignments shall be by instruments in writing duly executed. Acknowledgment shall be prima facie evidence of the execution of an assignment and when recorded in the Patent Office the record shall be prima facie evidence of execution. An assignment shall be void as against any subsequent purchaser for a valuable consideration without notice, unless it is recorded in the Patent Office within 3 months after the date thereof or prior to such subsequent purchase. The Commissioner shall keep a separate record of such assignments submitted to him for recording.

An assignee not domiciled in the United States shall be subject to and comply with the provisions of section 1 (d) hereof.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND VERIFICATIONS

SEC. 11. Acknowledgments and verifications required hereunder may be made before any person within the United States authorized by law to administer oaths, or, when made in a foreign country, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States or before any official authorized to administer oaths in the foreign country concerned whose authority shall be proved by a certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, and shall be valid if they comply with the laws of the State or country where made.

PUBLICATION

SEC. 12. (a) Upon the filing of an application for registration and payment of the fee herein provided, the Commissioner shall refer the application to the examiner in charge of the registration of marks, who shall cause an examination to be made and, if on such examination it shall appear that the applicant is entitled to registration, the Commissioner shall cause the mark to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office.

(b) If the applicant is found not entitled to registration, the examiner shall advise the applicant thereof and of the reasons therefor. The applicant shall have a period of 6 months in which to reply or amend his application, which shall then be reexamined. This procedure may be repeated until (1) the examiner finally refuses registration of the mark or (2) the applicant fails for a period of 6 months to reply or amend or appeal, whereupon the application shall be deemed to have been abandoned, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay in responding was unavoidable, whereupon such time may be extended.

(c) A registrant of a mark registered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, may, at any time prior to the expiration of the registration thereof, upon the payment of the prescribed fee file with the Commissioner an affidavit setting forth those goods stated in the registration on which said mark is in use in commerce and that the registrant claims the benefits of this act for said mark. The Commissioner shall publish notice thereof with a reproduction of said mark in the Official Gazette, and notify the registrant of such publication and of the requirement for the affidavit of use or nonuse as provided for in subsection (b) of section 8 of this act.

OPPOSITION

SEC. 13. Any person who believes that he would be damaged by the registration of a mark upon the principal register may, upon payment of the required fee, file a verified notice of opposition in the Patent Office, stating the grounds therefor, within 30 days after the publication under subsection (a) of section 12 of this act of the mark sought to be registered. For good cause shown, the time for filing notice of opposition may be extended by the Commissioner, who shall notify the applicant. An unverified opposition may be filed by a duly authorized attorney, but such opposition shall be null and void unless verified by the opposer within a reasonable time after such filing to be fixed by the Commissioner.

CANCELATION

SEC. 14. Any person who believes that he is or will be damaged by the registration of a mark on the principal register established by this act, or under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, may upon the payment of the prescribed fee apply to cancel said registration—

- (a) within 5 years from the date of the registration of the mark under this act; or
- (b) within 5 years from the date of the publication under section 12 (c) hereof of a

mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905; or

(c) at any time if the registered mark has been abandoned or its registration was obtained fraudulently or contrary to the provisions of subsections (a), (b), or (c) of section 2 of this act for a registration hereunder, or contrary to similar prohibitory provisions of said prior acts for a registration thereunder, or if the registered mark has been assigned and is being used by, or with the permission of, the assignee so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used, or if the mark was registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, and has not been published under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 12 of this act.

SEC. 15. Except on a ground for which application to cancel may be filed at any time under subsection (c) of section 14 of this act, and except to the extent, if any, to which the use of a mark registered on the principal register infringes a valid right acquired under the law of any State or Territory by use of a mark or trade name continuing from a date prior to the date of the publication under this act of such registered mark, the right of the registrant to use such registered mark in commerce for the goods or services on or in connection with which such registered mark has been in continuous use for 5 consecutive years subsequent to the date of such registration and is still in use in commerce, shall be incontestable, provided:

(1) there has been no final decision adverse to registrant's claim of ownership of such mark for such goods or services, or to registrant's right to register the same or to keep the same on the register; and

(2) there is no proceeding involving said rights pending in the Patent Office or in a court and not finally disposed of; and

(3) that an affidavit is filed with the Commissioner within 1 year after the expiration of any such 5-year period setting forth those goods or services stated in the registration on or in connection with which such mark has been in continuous use for such 5 consecutive years and is still in use in commerce, and the other matters specified in subsections (1) and (2) hereof.

Subject to the conditions above specified in this section, the incontestable right with reference to a mark registered under this act shall apply to a mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, upon the filing of the required affidavit with the Commissioner within 1 year after the expiration of any period of 5 consecutive years after the date of publication of a mark under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 12 of this act.

The Commissioner shall notify any registrant who files the above-prescribed affidavit of the filing thereof.

INTERFERENCE

SEC. 16. Whenever application is made for the registration of a mark which so resembles a mark previously registered by another, or for the registration of which another has previously made application, as to be likely when applied to the goods or when used in connection with the services of the applicant to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers, the Commissioner may declare that an interference exists. No interference shall be declared between an application and the registration of a mark the right to the use of which has become incontestable.

SEC. 17. In every case of interference, opposition to registration, application to register as a lawful concurrent user, or application to cancel the registration of a mark, the Commissioner shall give notice to all parties and shall direct the examiner in charge of interferences to determine and decide the respective rights of registration.

SEC. 18. In such proceedings the Commissioner may refuse to register the opposed mark, may cancel or restrict the registration of a registered mark, or may refuse to register any or all of several interfering marks, or may register the mark or marks for the person or persons entitled thereto, as the rights of the parties hereunder may be established in the proceedings: *Provided*, That in the case of the registration of any mark based on concurrent use, the Commissioner shall determine and fix the conditions and limitations provided for in subsection (d) of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 19. In all inter partes proceedings equitable principles of laches, estoppel, and acquiescence, where applicable may be considered and applied. The provisions of this section shall also govern proceedings heretofore begun in the Patent Office and not finally determined.

SEC. 20. An appeal may be taken to the Commissioner in person from any final decision of the examiner in charge of interferences or of the registration of marks upon the payment of the prescribed fees.

SEC. 21. Any applicant for registration of a mark, party to an interference proceeding, party to an opposition proceeding, party to an application to register as a lawful concurrent user, party to a cancellation proceeding, or any registrant who has filed an affidavit as provided in section 8, who is dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioner may appeal to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or may proceed under section 4915, Revised Statutes, as in the case of applicants for patents, under the same conditions, rules, and procedure as are prescribed in the case of patent appeals or proceedings so far as they are applicable: *Provided*, That any party who is satisfied with the decision of the Commissioner shall, upon the filing of an appeal to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals by any dissatisfied party, have the right to elect to have all further proceedings under Revised Statutes, 4915, by election as provided in Revised Statutes, 4911.

REGISTRATION IS NOTICE

SEC. 22. Registration of a mark on the principal register provided by this act or under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, shall be constructive notice of the registrant's claim of ownership thereof.

TITLE II—THE SUPPLEMENTAL REGISTER

SEC. 23. In addition to the principal register, the Commissioner shall keep a continuation of the register provided in paragraph (b) of section 1 of the act of March 19, 1920, entitled "An act to give effect to certain provisions of the convention for the protection of trade-marks and commercial names, made and signed in the city of Buenos Aires, in the Argentine Republic, August 20, 1910, and for other purposes", to be called the supplemental register. All marks capable of distinguishing applicant's goods or services and not registrable on the principal register herein provided, except those declared to be unregistrable under paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 2 of this act, which have been in lawful use in commerce by the proprietor thereof, upon or in connection with any goods or services for the year preceding the filing of the application may be registered on the supplemental register upon the payment of the prescribed fee and compliance with the provisions of section 1 so far as they are applicable.

Upon the filing of an application for registration on the supplemental register and payment of the fee herein provided the Commissioner shall refer the application to the examiner in charge of the registration of marks, who shall cause an examination to be made and if on such examination it shall appear that the applicant is entitled to regis-

tration, the registration shall be granted. If the applicant is found not entitled to registration the provisions of subsection (b) of section 12 of this act shall apply.

For the purposes of registration on the supplemental register, a mark may consist of any trade-mark, symbol, label, package, configuration of goods, name, word, slogan, phrase, surname, geographical name, numeral, or device or any combination of any of the foregoing, but such mark must be capable of distinguishing the applicant's goods or services.

Upon a proper showing by the applicant that he has begun the lawful use of his mark in foreign commerce and that he requires domestic registration as a basis for foreign protection of his mark, the Commissioner may waive the requirement of a full year's use and may grant registration forthwith.

CANCELATION

SEC. 24. Marks for the supplemental register shall not be published for or be subject to opposition, but shall be published on registration in the Official Gazette of Patent Office. Whenever any person believes that he is or will be damaged by a registration of a mark on this register he may at any time apply to the Commissioner to cancel the registration thereof. The Commissioner shall refer such application to the examiner in charge of interferences, who shall give notice thereof to the registrant. If it is found after a hearing before the examiner that the registrant was not entitled to register the mark at the time of his application for registration thereof, or that the mark is not used by the registrant or has been abandoned, the registration shall be canceled by the Commissioner.

SEC. 25. The certificates of registration for marks registered on the supplemental register shall be conspicuously different from certificates issued for marks registered on the principal register.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 26. The provisions of this act shall govern so far as applicable applications for registration and registrations on the supplemental register as well as those on the principal register, but applications for and registrations on the supplemental register shall not be subject to or receive the advantages of sections 2 (e), 2 (f), 7 (b), 12 (a), 13 to 18, inclusive, 22, 33, and 42 of this act.

SEC. 27. Registration of a mark on the supplemental register, or under the act of March 19, 1920, shall not preclude registration by the registrant on the principal register established by this act.

SEC. 28. Registration on the supplemental register or under the act of March 19, 1920, shall not be filed in the Department of the Treasury or be used to stop importations.

TITLE III—NOTICE OF REGISTRATION

SEC. 29. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 22 hereof, a registrant of a mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or on the principal register established by this act, shall give notice that his mark is registered by displaying with the mark as used the words "Registered in U. S. Patent Office" or "Reg. U. S. Pat. Off." or the letter R enclosed within a circle, thus (R); and in any suit for infringement under this act by such a registrant failing so to mark goods bearing the registered mark, or by a registrant under the act of March 19, 1920, or by the registrant of a mark on the supplemental register provided by this act no profits and no damages shall be recovered under the provisions of this act unless the defendant had actual notice of the registration: *Provided, however,* That the foregoing requirement as to notice shall be deemed fulfilled in respect to a registered mark used in connection with goods or services of foreign origin if the mark as used is accompanied by the notice of registration used in the country of origin of the goods or services to denote registration there.

TITLE IV—CLASSIFICATION

SEC. 30. The Commissioner shall establish a classification of goods and services, for convenience of Patent Office administration, but not to limit or extend the applicant's rights. The applicant may register his mark in one application for any or all of the goods or services included in one class, upon or in connection with which he is actually using the mark. The Commissioner may issue a single certificate for one mark registered in a plurality of classes upon payment of a fee equaling the sum of the fees for each registration in each class.

TITLE V—FEES AND CHARGES

SEC. 31. The following fees shall be paid to the Patent Office under this act:

On filing each original application for registration of a mark in each class in either the principal or the supplemental register, \$15; on filing each application for renewal in each class, \$15; and on filing each application for renewal in each class after expiration of the registration, an additional fee of \$5; on filing notice of claim of benefits of this act for a mark to be published under section 12 (c) hereof, \$5; on filing notice of opposition or application for cancellation, \$10; on appeal from an examiner in charge of the registration of marks to the Commissioner, \$20; on appeal from an examiner in charge of interferences to the Commissioner, \$30; for issuance of a new certificate of registration following change of ownership of a mark or correction of a registrant's mistake, \$10; for certificate of correction of registrant's mistake, \$10; for filing in each class each application communicated to the United States from the International Bureau, Habana, \$15; for filing and transmitting application in each class to the International Bureau, Habana, including certificate, \$10; for manuscript copies, for every 100 words or fraction thereof, 10 cents; for comparing other copies, 5 cents for every 100 words or fraction thereof; for certifying in any case, additional, 75 cents; for each additional registration or application which may be included under a single certificate, 25 cents additional; for filing disclaimer, amendment, surrender, or cancellation after registration, \$10.

For abstracts of title: For the search, 1 hour or less, and certificate, \$3; each additional hour or fraction thereof, \$1.50; for each brief from the digest of assignments of 200 words or less, 50 cents; each additional 100 words or fraction thereof, 10 cents.

For certificate that trade-mark has not been registered—search and certificate (for deposit in foreign countries only), \$3.

For title reports required for office use, \$1.

For a single printed copy of statement and drawing, 10 cents; if certified, for the grant, additional, 50 cents; for the certificate, 50 cents; if renewed, for copy of certificate of renewal, additional, 50 cents.

For photographic copies of records, per page, 20 cents; if certified, for the certificate, additional, 50 cents.

For photographic copies of drawings, per sheet, 20 cents.

For recording every assignment or other paper not exceeding six pages, \$3; for each additional two pages or less, \$1; for each additional registration or application included, or involved in one writing where more than one is so included or involved, additional, 50 cents.

The Commissioner shall refund fees paid by mistake or in excess.

TITLE VI—REMEDIES

SEC. 32. (1) Any person who shall, in commerce, (a) use, without the consent of the registrant, any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of any registered mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or advertising of any goods or services on or in connection with which such use is likely to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers as to the source

of origin of such goods or services; or (b) reproduce, counterfeit, copy, or colorably imitate any such mark and apply such reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation to labels, signs, prints, packages, wrappers, receptacles, or advertisements intended to be used upon or in connection with the sale in commerce of such goods or services, shall be liable to a civil action by the registrant for any or all of the remedies hereinafter provided, except that under subsection (b) hereof the registrant shall not be entitled to recover profits or damages unless the acts have been committed with knowledge that such mark is intended to be used to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the remedies given to the owner of the right infringed shall be limited as follows: (a) Where an infringer is engaged solely in the business of printing the mark for others and establishes that he was an innocent infringer the owner of the right infringed shall be entitled as against such infringer only to an injunction against future printing; (b) where the infringement complained of is contained in or is part of paid advertising matter in a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical the remedies of the owner of the right infringed as against the publisher or distributor of such newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical shall be confined to an injunction against the presentation of such advertising matter in future issues of such newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical: *Provided,* That these limitations shall apply only to innocent infringers; (c) injunction relief shall not be available to the owner of the right infringed in respect of an issue of a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical containing infringing matter after the commencement or preparation of the engraving or composition work for the issue containing such infringing matter.

(3) If goods bearing a registered mark have been put on the market by or with the authority of the registrant of a registered mark or in any package or other container bearing said mark and a notice that the goods may be resold only unaltered or unrenovated or in the original package or container and said goods or any part thereof have, without the authority of the registrant, been transferred to another package or container or been in any way altered or renovated, any person who shall, in commerce, make any use of or reference to said registered mark upon or in connection with the sale or advertising of such transferred or altered or renovated goods shall be liable to a civil action by the registrant for any or all of the remedies hereinafter provided.

SEC. 33. (a) Any certificate of registration issued under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or of a mark registered on the principal register provided by this act and owned by the plaintiff shall be admissible in evidence and shall be prima facie evidence of registrant's exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on the goods or services specified in the certificate subject to any conditions or limitations stated therein, but shall not preclude the defendant from proving any legal or equitable defense which would have been available to him if the plaintiff's mark had not been registered.

(b) If the right to use the registered mark has become incontestable under section 15 hereof, the certificate shall be conclusive evidence of the registrant's exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate subject to any conditions or limitations stated therein except when one of the following defenses is established:

(1) That the registration or the incontestable right to use the mark was obtained fraudulently; or

(2) That the mark has been abandoned by the registrant; or

(3) That the registered mark has been assigned and is being used, by or with the permission of the assignee, so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used; or

(4) That the use by the defendant of the name, term, or device charged to be an infringement is a use, otherwise than as a trade or service mark, of the defendant's individual name in his own business, or of the individual name of anyone in privity with the defendant, or of a term or device which is descriptive of and used fairly and in good faith only to describe to users the goods or services of the defendant, or their geographic origin; or

(5) That the mark whose use by the defendant is charged as an infringement was adopted without knowledge of the registrant's prior use and has been continuously used by the defendant or those in privity with him from a date prior to the publication of the registered mark under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act: *Provided, however*, That this defense shall apply only for the area in which such continuous prior use is proved.

SEC. 34. The several courts vested with jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this act shall have power to grant injunctions, according to the principles of equity and upon such terms as the court may deem reasonable, to prevent the violation of any right of the registrant of a mark registered in the Patent Office. Any such injunction may include a provision directing the defendant to file with the court and serve on the plaintiff within 30 days after the service on the defendant of such injunction, or such extended period as the court may direct, a report in writing under oath setting forth in detail the manner and form in which the defendant has complied with the injunction. Any such injunction granted upon hearing, after notice to the defendant, by any district court of the United States, may be served on the parties against whom such injunction is granted anywhere in the United States where they may be found, and shall be operative and may be enforced by proceedings to punish for contempt, or otherwise, by the court by which such injunction was granted, or by any other United States district court in whose jurisdiction the defendant may be found.

The said courts shall have jurisdiction to enforce said injunction, as herein provided, as fully as if the injunction had been granted by the district court in which it is sought to be enforced. The clerk of the court or judge granting the injunction shall, when required to do so by the court before which application to enforce said injunction is made, transfer without delay to said court a certified copy of all papers on file in his office upon which said injunction was granted.

It shall be the duty of the clerks of such courts within 1 month after the filing of any action, suit, or proceeding arising under the provisions of this act to give notice thereof in writing to the Commissioner setting forth in order so far as known the names and addresses of the litigants and the designating number or numbers of the registration or registrations upon which the action, suit, or proceeding has been brought, and in the event any other registration be subsequently included in the action, suit, or proceeding by amendment, answer, or other pleading, the clerk shall give like notice thereof to the Commissioner, and within 1 month after the decision is rendered, appeal taken or a decree issued the clerk of the court shall give notice thereof to the Commissioner, and it shall be the duty of the Commissioner on receipt of such notice forthwith to endorse the same upon the file wrapper of the said registration or registrations and to incorporate the same as a part of the contents of

said file wrapper; and for each notice required and furnished to the Commissioner in compliance herewith a fee of 50 cents shall be taxed by the clerk as costs of suit.

SEC. 35. Whenever the plaintiff shall have established his right to relief in any civil action arising under this act, he shall be entitled (subject to the provisions of section 29) to recover (1) defendant's profits, (2) any damages sustained by the plaintiff, and (3) the costs of the action. The court shall assess such profits and damages or cause the same to be assessed under its direction. In assessing profits the plaintiff shall be required to prove defendant's sales only; defendant must prove all elements of cost or deduction claimed. In assessing damages the court may enter judgment, according to the circumstances of the case, for any sum above the amount found as actual damages, not exceeding three times such amount. If the court shall find that the amount of the recovery based on profits is either inadequate or excessive the court may in its discretion enter judgment for such sum as the court shall find to be just, according to the circumstances of the case. Such sum in either of the above circumstances shall constitute compensation and not a penalty.

SEC. 36. In any action arising under this act, in which the plaintiff shall have established his right to relief, the court may order that all labels, signs, prints, packages, wrappers, receptacles, and advertisements in the possession of the defendant, bearing the mark of the plaintiff or any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation thereof, and all plates, molds, matrices, and other means of making the same, shall be delivered up and destroyed.

SEC. 37. In any action involving a registered mark the court may determine the right to registration, order the cancellation of registrations, in whole or in part, restore canceled registrations, and otherwise rectify the register with respect to the registrations of any party to the action. Decrees and orders shall be certified by the court to the Commissioner, who shall make appropriate entry upon the records of the Patent Office, and shall be controlled thereby.

SEC. 38. Any person who shall procure registration in the Patent Office of a mark by a false or fraudulent declaration or representation, oral or in writing, or by any false means, shall be liable in a civil action by any person injured thereby for any damages sustained in consequence thereof.

SEC. 39. The district and territorial courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, the circuit courts of appeals of the United States and the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia shall have appellate jurisdiction, of all actions arising under this act, without regard to the amount in controversy or to diversity or lack of diversity of the citizenship of the parties.

SEC. 40. Writs of certiorari may be granted by the Supreme Court of the United States for the review of cases arising under this act in the same manner as provided for in cases under the patent laws.

SEC. 41. The Commissioner shall make rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, for the conduct of proceedings in the Patent Office under this act.

TITLE VII—IMPORTATION FORBIDDEN OF GOODS BEARING INFRINGING MARKS OR NAMES

SEC. 42. (a) Any goods, whatever may be their source, or origin, which shall bear any mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or on the principal register provided by this act, or any infringement of a mark so registered shall not be imported into the United States or admitted to entry at any customhouse of the United States unless the written consent of the registrant to such importation or entry be first had and obtained or unless such offending mark be removed or obliterated; and, if brought into the United States in violation

of the provisions of this section, any person selling, offering for sale, or dealing in such goods shall be subject, at the suit of the registrant, to the liabilities for infringement provided in this act and, in addition, be required to export or destroy such goods or to remove or obliterate such infringing mark therefrom, and such goods shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture for violation of the customs laws: *Provided*, That in order to aid the officers of customs in enforcing this paragraph, the registrant of the mark shall deposit in the Department of the Treasury a facsimile of the registration certificate, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

(b) Any goods, whatever may be their source of origin, which shall bear the trade or commercial name or a simulation thereof of any domestic manufacturer or trader, or of any manufacturer or trader located in any foreign country which by treaty, convention, or law affords similar privileges to citizens of the United States, shall not be imported into the United States or admitted to entry at any customhouse of the United States unless the written consent of such manufacturer or trader to such importation or entry be first had and obtained, or unless such offending name be removed or obliterated, and if brought into the United States in violation of the provisions of this section, any person may be enjoined from selling, offering for sale, dealing in, or advertising such goods and in addition be required to export or destroy such goods or to remove or obliterate such name therefrom, and the goods shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture for violation of the customs laws: *Provided*, That in order to aid the officers of customs in enforcing this paragraph, such domestic or foreign manufacturer or trader shall deposit in the Department of the Treasury a facsimile of his trade or commercial name, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

(c) The owner, importer, or consignee of goods refused entry or seized under paragraph (a) or (b) of this section may have relief against the registrant, manufacturer, or trader by a summary proceeding in any United States court of original jurisdiction, in the district where such goods are held or where such registrant, manufacturer, or trader, or a designated representative, is an inhabitant or may be found, or, if the registrant is a foreigner and no designation of a representative has been filed, then in the District of Columbia, and after such notice and upon such proceedings as the court may direct, the court may determine whether the plaintiff for any reason has the right to import such goods under the trade or commercial name or mark which they bear.

(d) A decree or order of such court for the plaintiff, upon being certified to the collector of the port where the goods are held, shall be warrant to such collector to release the goods from arrest or seizure or forfeiture under this section.

(e) An order or decree for either party, whether interlocutory or final, shall be appealable within 30 days, and the court making such order or decree may, in its discretion, suspend the operation thereof pending appeal.

TITLE VIII—FALSE DESIGNATIONS OF ORIGIN AND FALSE DESCRIPTIONS FORBIDDEN

SEC. 43. (a) Any person who shall affix, apply, or annex, or use in connection with any goods or services, or any container or containers for goods, a false designation of origin, or any false description or representation, including words or other symbols tending falsely to describe or represent the same, and shall cause such goods or services to enter into commerce, and any person who shall with knowledge of the falsity of such designation of origin or description or representation cause or procure the same to be transported or used in commerce or deliver

the same to any carrier to be transported or used, shall be liable to a civil action by any person doing business in the locality falsely indicated as that of origin or in the region in which said locality is situated, or by any person who believes that he is or is likely to be damaged by the use of any such false description or representation.

(b) Any goods marked or labeled in contravention of the provisions of this section shall not be imported into the United States or admitted to entry at any customhouse of the United States. The owner, importer, or consignee of goods refused entry at any customhouse under this section may have any recourse by protest or appeal that is given under the customs revenue laws or may have the remedy given by this act in cases involving goods refused entry or seized.

TITLE IX—INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS

SEC. 44. (a) The Commissioner shall keep a register of all marks communicated to him by the international bureaus provided for by the conventions for the protection of industrial property, trade-marks, trade and commercial names, and the repression of unfair competition to which the United States is or may become a party, and upon the payment of the fees required by such conventions and the fees herein prescribed may place the marks so communicated upon such register. This register shall show a facsimile of the mark or trade or commercial name; the name, citizenship, and address of the registrant; the number, date, and place of the first registration of the mark, including the dates on which application for such registration was filed and granted and the term of such registration; a list of goods or services to which the mark is applied as shown by the registration in the country of origin, and such other data as may be useful concerning the mark. This register shall be a continuation of the register provided in section (a) of the act of March 19, 1920.

(b) Persons who are nationals of, domiciled in, or have a bona fide and effective business or commercial establishment in any foreign country, which is a party to (1) the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, signed at Paris on March 20, 1883; or (2) the General Inter-American Convention for Trade Mark and Commercial Protection, signed at Washington on February 20, 1929; or (3) any other convention or treaty relating to trade-marks, trade or commercial names, or the repression of unfair competition to which the United States is a party, shall be entitled to the benefits and subject to the provisions of this act to the extent and under the conditions essential to give effect to any such conventions and treaties so long as the United States shall continue to be a party thereto, except as provided in the following paragraphs of this section.

(c) No registration of a mark in the United States by a person described in paragraph (b) of this section shall be perfected until such mark has been registered in the country of origin of the applicant, when such country makes the same requirement of nationals or residents of the United States unless the applicant alleges use in commerce.

For the purposes of this section, the country of origin of the applicant is the country in which he has a bona fide and effective industrial or commercial establishment and, in the case of associations, the country in which the association has its domicile or its principal office.

(d) An application for registration of a mark under sections 1, 2, 3, 4, or 23 of this act filed by a person described in paragraph (b) of this section who has previously duly filed an application for registration of the same mark in one of the countries described in paragraph (b) shall be accorded the same force and effect as would be accorded to the

same application if filed in the United States on the same date on which the application was first filed in such foreign country: *Provided, That—*

(1) the application in the United States is filed within 6 months from the date on which the application was first filed in the foreign country;

(2) the application conforms as nearly as practicable to the requirements of this act, but use in commerce need not be alleged;

(3) the rights acquired by third parties before the date of the filing of the first application in the foreign country shall in no way be affected by a registration obtained on an application filed under this subsection (d);

(4) nothing in this subsection (d) shall entitle the foreign applicant to sue for infringement of his mark prior to the date on which his mark was registered in this country unless the registration is based on use in commerce.

(e) A mark duly registered in the country of origin of the foreign applicant may be registered on the principal register if eligible, otherwise on the supplemental register herein provided. The application therefor shall be accompanied by a certified copy of the application for or registration in the country of origin of the applicant.

(f) The registration of a mark under the provisions of paragraphs (c), (d), and (e) of this section by a person described in paragraph (b) shall be independent of the registration in the country of origin and the duration, validity, or transfer in the United States of such registration shall be governed by the provisions of this act.

(g) Trade names or commercial names of persons described in paragraph (b) of this section shall be protected without the obligation of filing or registration whether or not they form parts of marks.

(h) Any person designated in paragraph (b) of this section as entitled to the benefits and subject to the provisions of this act shall be entitled to effective protection against unfair competition, and the remedies provided herein against infringement of trade-marks shall be available so far as they may be appropriate in repressing acts of unfair competition.

(i) Citizens or residents of the United States shall have the same benefits as are granted by this section to persons described in paragraph (b) hereof.

TITLE X—CONSTRUCTION AND DEFINITIONS

SEC. 45. In the construction of this act, unless the contrary is plainly apparent from the context—

The United States includes and embraces all territory which is under its jurisdiction and control.

The word "commerce" means all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress.

The term "principal register" refers to the register provided for by sections 1 to 22 hereof, and the term "supplemental register" refers to the register provided for by sections 23 to 28 hereof.

The term "person" and any other word or term used to designate the applicant or other entitled to a benefit or privilege or rendered liable under the provisions of this act includes a juristic person as well as a natural person. The term "juristic person" includes a firm, corporation, union, association, or other organization capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

The terms "applicant" and "registrant" embrace the legal representatives and successors and assigns of such applicant or registrant.

The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Patents.

The term "related company" means any person who controls or is controlled by the

registrant or applicant for registration in respect to the nature and quality of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used.

The terms "trade name" and "commercial name" include individual names and surnames, firm names, and trade names used by manufacturers, industrialists, merchants, agriculturists, and others to identify their businesses, vocations, or occupations; the names or titles lawfully adopted and used by persons, firms, associations, corporations, companies, unions, and any manufacturing, industrial, commercial agricultural, or other organizations engaged in trade or commerce and capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

The term "trade-mark" includes any word, name, symbol, or device or any combination thereof adopted and used by a manufacturer or merchant to identify his goods and distinguish them from those manufactured or sold by others.

The term "service mark" means a mark used in the sale or advertising of services to identify the services of one person and distinguish them from the services of others and includes without limitation the marks, names, symbols, titles, designations, slogans, character names, and distinctive features of radio or other advertising used in commerce.

Each of the terms "collective mark" or "certification mark" means a mark used upon or in connection with the products or services of one or more persons other than the owner of the mark to certify or indicate regional or other original, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy, or other characteristics of such goods or services or to indicate a membership in an association or other organization or that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization.

The term "mark" includes any trade-mark, service mark, collective mark, or certification mark entitled to registration under this act whether registered or not.

For the purposes of this act a mark shall be deemed to be used in commerce (a) on goods when it is placed in any manner on the goods or their containers or the displays associated therewith or on the tags or labels affixed thereto and the goods are sold or transported in commerce and (b) on services when it is used or displayed in the sale or advertising of services and the services are rendered in commerce.

A mark shall be deemed to be "abandoned"—

(a) When its use has been discontinued with intent not to resume. Intent not to resume may be inferred from circumstances. Discontinuance of use for 2 consecutive years shall be prima facie abandonment.

(b) When any course of conduct of the registrant, including acts of omission as well as commission, causes the mark to lose its significance as an indication of origin.

The term "colorable imitation" includes any mark which so resembles a registered mark as to be likely to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers.

The term "registered mark" means a mark registered in the United States Patent Office under this act or under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or the act of March 19, 1920. The phrase "marks registered in the Patent Office" means registered marks.

The term "Act of March 3, 1881," "Act of February 20, 1905," or "Act of March 19, 1920," means the respective act as amended.

A "counterfeit" is a spurious mark which is identical with, or substantially indistinguishable from, a registered mark.

Words used in the singular include the plural and vice versa.

The intent of this act is to regulate commerce within the control of Congress by

making actionable the deceptive and misleading use of marks in such commerce; to protect registered marks used in such commerce from interference by State, or Territorial legislation; to protect persons engaged in such commerce against unfair competition; to prevent fraud and deception in such commerce by the use of reproductions, copies, counterfeits, or colorable imitations of registered marks; and to provide rights and remedies stipulated by treaties and conventions respecting trade-marks, trade names, and unfair competition entered into between the United States and foreign nations.

TITLE XI—REPEAL OF PREVIOUS ACTS

Sec. 46. (a) This act shall be in force, and take effect 1 year from its enactment, but except as otherwise herein specifically provided shall not affect any suit, proceeding, or appeal then pending. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed effective 1 year from the enactment hereof, including the following acts insofar as they are inconsistent herewith: The act of Congress approved March 3, 1881, entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks and protect the same;" the act approved August 5, 1882, entitled "An act relating to the registration of trade-marks"; the act of February 20, 1905 (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 81 to 109, inclusive), entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with Indian tribes, and to protect the same," and the amendments thereto by the acts of May 4, 1906 (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 131 and 132; 34 Stat. 169), March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1251, 1252), February 18, 1909 (35 Stat. 627, 628); February 18, 1911 (36 Stat. 918), January 8, 1913 (37 Stat. 649), June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 647), March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1268, 1269), April 11, 1930 (46 Stat. 155); act June 10, 1938 (Public, No. 586, 75th Cong., ch. 332 3d sess.); the act of March 19, 1920 (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 121 to 128, inclusive), entitled "An act to give effect to certain provisions of the convention for the protection of trade-marks and commercial names made and signed in the city of Buenos Aires, in the Argentine Republic, August 20, 1910, and for other purposes"; and the amendments thereto, including act June 10, 1938 (Public, No. 586, 75th Cong., ch. 332, 3d sess.); and section 526 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., title 19, sec. 1526), provided, that this repeal shall not affect the validity of registrations granted or applied for under any of said acts prior to the effective date of this act, or rights or remedies thereunder except as provided in sections 8, 12, 14, 15, and 47 of this act; but nothing contained in this act shall be construed as limiting or restricting any statute in force on the effective date of this act which does not relate to trade-marks, or as restricting or increasing the authority of any Federal regulatory agency except as may be specifically provided in this act.

(b) Registrations now existing under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, shall continue in full force and effect for the unexpired terms thereof and may be renewed under the provisions of section 9 of this act. Such registrations and the renewals thereof shall be subject to and shall be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of this act to the same extent and with the same force and effect as though registered on the principal register established by this act except as limited in section 8, 12, 14, and 15 of this act. Marks registered under the "10-year proviso" of section 5 of the act of February 20, 1905, as amended, shall be deemed to have become distinctive of the registrant's goods in commerce under paragraph (f) of section 2 of this act and may be renewed under section 9 hereof as marks coming within said paragraph.

Registrations now existing under the act of March 19, 1920, shall expire 6 months after the effective date of this act, or 20 years

from the dates of their registrations, whichever date is later. Such registrations shall be subject to and entitled to the benefits of the provisions of this act relating to marks registered on the supplemental register established by this act, and may not be renewed unless renewal is required to support foreign registrations. In that event renewal may be effected on the supplemental register under the provisions of section 9 of this act.

Marks registered under previous acts may, if eligible, also be registered under this act.

Sec. 47. (a) All applications for registration pending in the Office of the Commissioner at the effective date of this act may be amended, if practicable, to bring them under the provisions of this act. The prosecution of such applications so amended and the grant of registrations thereon shall be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of this act. If such amendments are not made, the prosecution of said applications shall be proceeded with and registrations thereon granted in accordance with the acts under which said applications were filed, and said acts are hereby continued in force to this extent and for this purpose only, notwithstanding the foregoing general repeal thereof.

(b) In any case in which an appeal is pending before the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or any United States Circuit Court of Appeals or the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia or the United States Supreme Court at the effective date of this act, the court, if it be of the opinion that the provisions of this act are applicable to the subject matter of the appeal, may apply such provision or may remand the case to the Commissioner or to the district court for the taking of additional evidence or a new trial or for reconsideration of the decision on the record as made, as the appellate court may deem proper.

Sec. 48. Section 4 of the act of January 5, 1905 (U. S. C., title 36, sec. 4), as amended, entitled "An act to incorporate the National Red Cross," and section 7 of the act of June 15, 1916 (U. S. C., title 36, sec. 27), entitled "An act to incorporate the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes," and the act of June 20, 1936 (U. S. C., title 22, sec. 248), entitled "An act to prohibit the commercial use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation," are not repealed or affected by this act.

Sec. 49. Nothing herein shall adversely affect the rights or the enforcement of rights in marks acquired in good faith prior to the effective date of this act.

Sec. 50. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 7, line 3, insert a comma after the word "applicable."

Page 9, line 8, insert an apostrophe before the final "s" in "registrants" and strike out the comma after that word.

Page 18, line 7, strike out the comma after "incontestable" and insert a colon; capitalize and italicize the word "provided"; strike out the colon and insert a comma; add "That—"

Page 18, line 15, strike out "that."

Page 23, line 10, after "of", insert "the."

Page 23, line 12, strike out "a", first occurrence, and insert "the."

Page 23, line 13, strike out "the", last occurrence, and insert "such."

Page 23, line 14, strike out "thereof."

Page 27, line 19, after "additional", insert a comma.

Page 28, line 10, strike out "or", first occurrence, and insert "of."

Page 35, line 14, strike out "of" and insert "for." The official title of this court is

"United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia."

Page 36, line 4, strike out "or" and insert "of."

Page 39, lines 24 and 25, change all capital letters to lower case.

Page 40, line 14, after "section", insert the figure "1."

Page 47, line 17, "trade names" should not be italicized.

Page 48, line 13, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma.

Page 48, line 16, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma; strike out "act."

Page 48, line 23, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma.

Page 48, line 24, after "including", insert "the", and after "act" insert "of."

Page 49, line 2, before "provided", change the comma to a colon; capitalize and italicize "provided"; insert a comma after "provided"; capitalize "that."

Page 50, line 16, insert "Patent" before "Office"; strike out "of the Commissioner."

Page 51, line 6, strike out "of", second occurrence, and insert "for."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative business and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article by a former distinguished Congressman from my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago on the floor of the House I ventured the assertion that the best service we could render the American people, who are loyally exerting a single-minded effort to the winning of the war, would be to adjourn and go home, following passage of needed appropriation bills.

I was so bold as to say we were contributing little to the victory of which we are now confident, but, on the contrary, were legislating in an atmosphere of hysteria and almost hatred that inevitably must communicate itself to the

Nation and destroy the morale and unity which we need so urgently.

Subsequent events, in my opinion, justify that statement. Since it was uttered the situation has steadily grown worse. Only Friday of last week, within 2 hours after the President vetoed the so-called labor-disputes bill, setting forth specifically his reasons, which the New York Times in an editorial last Saturday said were sound reasons, and following an inflammatory speech by that matchless orator of Virginia (Mr. Woodrum), condemning the action of the President, we saw the spectacle of the House rushing in heatedly and almost hysterically to undo the President's veto with no time given to study the reasons the President gave for vetoing the bill. When we did that we were no longer acting as a deliberative body of representatives of the people.

Of course, the temperature in Washington is somewhat abnormal, and tempers have a habit of responding to the thermometer. But some of the things that have been transpiring cannot be attributed to the dog days. The causes go much deeper than the weather.

The simple truth is that we have been giving more attention to next year's political contest than to the campaigns our fighting men are waging in north Africa, in the south Pacific, in the bleak Aleutians, and on other battle fronts all over the world.

Referring specifically to Attu, I commend to the Members of the House the reading of the article entitled "Company X on Attu" in the June 21 Life magazine. It has graphically pointed out the sufferings and the indomitable courage of our soldiers, many of whom were nearly frozen while going into battle—no amount of clothing was enough; that they had gone as long as 16 days without having a chance to remove even their shoes or socks; that 61 of them went out in one company and 5 returned. The others were killed. All told, in that battle of Attu, 342 of these boys were killed, 1,135 wounded, 58 missing. It is said at least 1,791 Japs had to be killed in this one battle and only 11 were taken prisoners, which shows the caliber of the Japs' fighting force. It is easy to determine the kind of fight that is ahead of us with the Japs from that encounter when they would not be taken prisoners, preferring death. This means a fight to the end. Also let us think of our American boys who are being held Japanese prisoners, dying by the hundreds, as reported by the Red Cross, no doubt through lack of food. Let us think of the killing of these boys in north Africa and on all our fronts and on all seas.

My colleagues, in plain, blunt words, too many of us have been more interested in discrediting the administration and in destroying confidence in our Commander in Chief than in bringing about the speedy overthrow of the brutal Axis Powers.

The cold, unvarnished truth is that some Members of the House have been playing fast and loose with the Nation's destinies. The President's foes have made it perfectly clear they will leave nothing undone to hamper and

harass his conduct of the war, regardless of the consequences.

Let it be conceded right here that the President and his advisers have made mistakes—many of them. For such the remedy is criticism, but it should be constructive rather than destructive.

In a program so tremendous as that on which we have embarked, there is bound to be error, waste, and probably some graft. After all, the President has to deal with human beings, and the inherent defects and weaknesses of mankind are manifest in war as well as in peace.

But it is only fair to insist that those who are quick to point out the President's mistakes should be equally eager to give credit where it is deserved. Has anybody here heard a word of praise or commendation for the conduct of the war from those who day after day open the floodgates of abuse and pour calumny and vituperation not only on the head of the President, but also upon those of his subordinates, most of whom are doing a grand job?

Those who make mistakes or worse should be held to strict account, but in decency those who are performing magnificently should not be tarred with the same stick of criticism.

Anybody who takes the trouble to compare the progress made since Pearl Harbor with the record made in our last World War cannot, unless blinded by prejudice and malice or indifferent to his own reputation for fairness, withhold from those responsible for the conduct of the war a generous amount of credit.

Our production record has been magnificent. Donald Nelson has described it as little short of miraculous. Munitions of all kinds have been turned out in such volume as to stagger the imagination.

Very little is heard about that record on this side of the floor and scarcely a word from the other side. Rather, the Record is encumbered and valuable time taken up with wild and reckless statements about loss of time because of strikes, absenteeism, and so forth. As to strikes, President Roosevelt, in his message returning S. 796, makes this statement:

For the entire year of 1942 the time lost by strikes averaged only five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total man-hours worked. That record has never before been equaled in this country.

We have recruited a large and efficient Army which has acquitted itself as Americans always do when put to the test. Half-trained soldiers are not being sent out to bare their bodies to the enemy, as was the case in the last war. They are well equipped with the best of fighting and defensive equipment science and industry can produce, whereas a quarter of a century ago they had to depend on our allies not only for arms and equipment, but for food and other supplies.

Yes; I concede the administration has made mistakes—many of them, and some quite serious—but it has also done things of which it has every reason to be proud, and which we should be the first to recognize, if we are, as we pretend to be, representatives of the people and con-

cerned only that their interests go forward satisfactorily.

The tragic fact is that in this House reactionaries on both sides of the aisle have formed an unholy alliance to prevent, if they can, the reelection of Roosevelt next year. They have a perfect right to oppose the President and to elect a man of their own, if they can, but they have no right to play politics at the expense of the war effort. They have no right to inflame prejudices, arouse fears and alarms, to sow seeds of dissension and disunity. If they hate Roosevelt, that is their privilege, but, in venting that hate, they should be careful not to lend aid and comfort to the Nation's enemies.

I suppose Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo also hate Roosevelt. They would rejoice were he repudiated by the American people and ejected unceremoniously from the White House. I dare say that, on the chance that may happen, they may be induced to prolong the war, which they must recognize by this time they have lost.

Goebbels has declared that political and social tensions are so great in this country that it would not be difficult to tear us apart by internal strife and, perhaps, revolution. How Goebbels must have rejoiced at racial clashes which have occurred within recent weeks, the inspiration for which may have come directly from this floor. How he must have reveled at the untimely and unwarranted display of fury, anger, and hysteria evidenced last Friday by the Senate and this House. I have always maintained that our enemies cannot lick us but we can lick ourselves.

Quoting from the Philadelphia Record of June 28, 1943:

Prospects were never brighter for winning the war abroad. They were never darker for achieving unity at home.

To continue the policy of drift is dangerous.

I have not always agreed with the President. That is my right. But my duty in these days of peril, which, in my opinion, will be long continued, is to uphold his hands as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and to help him carry on this fight to victory.

It may be truthfully said also that some of those high up in administrative circles have been too industrious in keeping an eye on politics. If the people want President Roosevelt for President in 1944, his enemies cannot stop his reelection. Neither can the activities of a few ardent friends accomplish it against the will of the people. The people at that time will express themselves, but they are not interested in politics at this time. People are interested only in winning this war and putting an end to the merciless murdering of our boys and the gradual bankruptcy of our country.

My colleagues, we have a lot of hay down and the time has come when every true American—and we in the House hope to be included in that classification—should ponder the effect and consequences of his every word and deed on the progress of the war.

If we have to hate anybody, let us hate the murderous totalitarian dictators. It should be possible for us to engage in our quadrennial election without tearing down the very pillars of our glorious country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDAY). The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Montana may proceed for 1 additional minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Montana where he was at the time I was voting for the repeal of the embargo act and voting for the lend-lease program and other measures to preserve our country?

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that his question is entirely beside the point, which he knows—we are in war now, and I have no apology for any vote I have ever cast in this House; I voted against every step that I thought would take us into the war and during all of those days, I voted for every bill and every appropriation for our own defense, but once in the war, on the other hand, I voted for every appropriation and every measure that the President has asked for to fight the war. I shall vote for them first, last, and all the time. Any Member of the House, whether on this side or on that side of the aisle, who takes any position that jeopardizes the winning of this war for political reasons is not doing his duty as a Member of Congress or as a representative of the American people.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I have tried to support the President in all his war measures; I have been critical of the home front, and as the gentleman himself has suggested the subject of the fourth term, may I say that there is war on the home front for the fourth term.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman that the conditions I have just recited have brought the whole thing to the forefront, but the point I have in mind is that we must keep politics out until we win this war.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman himself mentioned the fourth term.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have tried to make it clear what has brought all of this about. If the people want Roosevelt they will elect him, and if they do not want him they will not elect him. No conniving can defeat the people's will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I made in the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 25 minutes.

N. Y. A. TRAINING PROGRAM IS IMPORTANT TO THE NATION'S WELFARE AND SHOULD BE CONTINUED

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in a short time Congress will determine the fate of the National Youth Administration. It will determine whether or not that Administration during the fiscal year 1944 shall train approximately 600,000 youths in industrial pursuits and thus make them effective contributors to our national war economy and useful and efficient members of society. I hope that Congress will say to the National Youth Administration: "You may continue your training program. You are doing a good work."

To the extent that I have a voice and influence I am exercising the same in behalf of a continuation of the N. Y. A. training program.

I say this notwithstanding there is no one in Congress, I believe, who has a greater desire than I have to see that economy in government is effected and that in every possible instance duplication and overlapping are eliminated. It has been argued that since there are half a dozen agencies in the field of vocational training the National Youth Administration might well be abolished and the trainees taken over under other agencies, but I find on very thorough investigation that there are two sound arguments against that proposal. One is that the N. Y. A. training program is a going program that is proceeding at full speed in turning out efficient trainees and constantly infiltrating them into plants all over the country where they are vitally needed and to disrupt that program now would slow up the war effort and do much harm. The other argument in favor of continuing the N. Y. A. training program is that there is no other program just like it. It enters into a different field and taps a potential source of timber for skilled manpower and womanpower that is not reached by any other training agency. I find that while it embraces persons of all races within the scope of its activities it is in many instances the only agency through which Negroes can obtain the technical and vocational training which they desire and to which they are entitled.

HOUSE HEARING WAS UNSATISFACTORY

The hearing which took place before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations in respect to the National Youth Administration was unsatisfactory and unconvincing. It was apparent that there was strong opposition in the House which put the fate of the measure in doubt. To some of us it seemed, under the circumstances, only fair to both the proponents and the opponents of the N. Y. A. that before action was taken there should be further hearings which would bring out all of the facts conclusively. Those hearings have taken place before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and printed copies are available for all who desire to read them. In my opinion, the N. Y. A. has made out a good case for the continuation of its training program.

I was impressed by the statement of former Gov. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, who was asked his opinion as to whether there is duplication as between the vocational-training program of the Office of Education and the N. Y. A. training program. He said:

There is no duplication. I might say, as an aside, that I feel that the experience of this war will bring about a development of vocational education hitherto unthought of, and that such development is to be desired. All of the facilities of the schools are being used. Likewise, the facilities of the National Youth Administration. They are to be found where other training is not offered. The two agencies are not in competition. They may supplement each other. For the most part, our National Youth Administration training stations are in spots where those who would like to have the training cannot obtain it from the schools. I have tried to see that there was not any conflict at all.

When asked his opinion as to whether it would be in the interest of economy to abandon the N. Y. A. training centers or stations, and transfer the trainees to the vocational schools under the Office of Education Governor McNutt replied:

It would be cheaper to maintain the present system for the time being; cheaper and better, for the reason that if you expected the schools to extend that activity it would take too long. The time is short. We cannot wait. The National Youth Administration is set up and is an operating organization today, successfully doing a job.

CLAIM OF POSSIBLE SAVING DISPROVED

So it seems to me that the claim that a saving might be effected by a consolidation of training agencies has been demonstrated to be nothing more than a will-o'-the-wisp. As to the essentiality of the training service that is being rendered by the N. Y. A.—a service that should be continued during the wartime when so many trained persons are vitally needed—I quote from the National Youth Administrator as follows:

To this committee I should like to submit the fact that since Pearl Harbor, National Youth Administration has trained over one-half million previously unemployed boys and girls. Accepting the estimate in the report that 50 percent of these go into war industry, it means that National Youth Administration has added over 250,000 trained youth to the rolls of war industry since Pearl Harbor. That, I believe, is a contribution of major importance to our war effort.

In the ensuing fiscal year, through the full utilization of our present shop facilities, it will be possible to give an average of 2 months' war-production training to 600,000 persons. In the course of their training these individuals will produce material for the armed services worth millions of dollars. It is certain that the disruption of this program, which transfer to any other group would necessarily entail, would paralyze this contribution to the war effort for months to come. Standing at the critical hour of the war when we shall need to throw every last ounce of our effort into production, I believe that action upon the recommendations would prove very detrimental to the war effort.

REPORT OF MRS. OLLIE M. WEEKS

I have recently made some diligent inquiries to ascertain the extent and progress of the N. Y. A. training activities in my home city, Indianapolis. If the work there is a criterion of what is going on throughout the Nation I am convinced the N. Y. A. training program is well worth while and is deserving of our wholehearted support. I quote as follows from a letter I have received from Mrs. Ollie M. Weeks, secretary of the Indianapolis branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

As per request in your letter of June 19 relative to information I submit the following concerning the Indianapolis projects of the National Youth Administration: There are 750 young persons receiving training in arc welding, radio, machine shop, aircraft, sheet metal, foundry, pattern making, clerical, and power sewing. All receive 160 hours of training per month. The shops are operated on 2- and 3-shift bases. Despite the great effort and resourcefulness there are still not facilities to take care of youths who need and request training for war industry. This program has been especially beneficial to colored persons who are anxious to accept every avenue that will contribute to the war effort. If your investigation goes far enough you will find that the National Youth Administration has offered us the greatest opportunity for training in vital industries and for making a greater contribution to the national defense and general welfare than any other agency in the history of our country.

Having constantly in mind my obligation to be of service to the people I represent and to protect the institutions which contribute to their welfare I could not be otherwise than deeply impressed by the letter of this very competent observer, Mrs. Weeks.

TESTIMONY OF MR. SENGSTACKE

A letter I have received from John H. Sengstacke, president of the Chicago Defender, also impresses me. It says in part:

We can give you thousands of cases of Negroes who have been aided by this agency and who were turned down by the educational authorities. Today thousands of Negroes are on the assembly lines in our war-production plants because the National Youth Administration had the vision to train them.

Mr. Sengstacke is one of the leaders of the Negro race and speaks with knowledge of his subject.

LETTER FROM ALBERT BECK

I have one other letter which especially impresses me, and with the indulgence of the House I shall read it before I take my seat. It is from a prominent businessman of my home city, Albert Beck, president of Niagara Products, Inc., of Indianapolis. He says under date of June 25:

I appreciate your reply to my letter regarding the National Youth Administration. The attitude I take on the matter is, of course, based upon my experience with that division of the National Youth Administration which trains young girls and young women in the profession of using a sewing machine for industrial purposes and that experience has been a very happy one.

When I first had a call from the National Youth Administration back in 1940 asking me if I could use any of their girls I was reluctant to give them a chance because I

had a prejudice against these bureaus. I, however, was prevailed upon to take in four National Youth Administration trained girls and they proved so satisfactory that when I need sewing-machine operator: my first thought is National Youth Administration.

I just came back from Detroit, having been there during the days of rioting. I noted that the rioters were youths, little more than boys, in the great majority. I believe proper useful outlets for these youths should be provided, and I think that vocational training is an essential toward this end. Many young people are not able to proceed from high school to college and a few months' intense vocational training is then what they need.

From the standpoint of the money spent I don't think it amounts to anything at all when you consider the millions of dollars which are being thrown away in all of our bureaus through inefficiency and mismanagement. While I am on the subject, Mr. Lunow, I might say that I get to different procurement centers and I cannot help but notice a loafing in the corridors, smoking cigarettes at desks, and groups loitering around coke vendors with no war-like attitude seen anywhere, much less a business attitude. If it would be possible for someone to plow through these Government offices and either make the people work a whole day's work or get out, millions would be saved. Maybe this cannot be done in a democracy, I don't know, but we do know it is done in business. Thanks again for answering my letter.

ACTION IS DEMAND NOW

If the National Youth Administration training program is to be saved it must be saved now. The situation requires immediate action. The bill is now pending in the Senate and will be voted on soon. I have had several conferences with the junior Senator from New York, in charge of the bill, and he tells me the vote will be very close. I take this occasion to suggest to Members of the House that you do not depend on letters, or even on the telephone, but that you go in person to the other end of the Capitol and see the Senators from your States and urge them to support the bill to continue the National Youth Administration's training program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on June 24 I was given the privilege of addressing the House concerning the meat situation. Shortly after concluding my remarks I left the floor on some business. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] took the floor and among other things referred to an article which appeared in the New York Times. I quote a portion of that article he referred to in his remarks which appear on page 6425 of the Record for Thursday, June 24:

Throughout the West an increasing number of individuals are buying and storing in freezers whole carcasses. These people are not comparable with members of the old prohibition bootleg trade; they are patriotic but they are determined that they shall not go hungry.

The gentleman from New York continued, and I quote his own words:

I take exception to that statement and I am inclined to the belief that since they are indulging in the bootleg market contrary to the law of the land—

Now, mark those words—

Contrary to the law of the land and the regulations promulgated thereunder—

Fix your minds on the words "regulations promulgated thereunder"—

He concludes with the statement:

They are not patriotic.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York organized the retail meat industry of Brooklyn and of course has as his constituents a great many gentlemen of that profession. I have nothing on earth to say against them but I do think the gentleman should be a little more temperate in his remarks when he refers to citizens who are represented by different Members of Congress, among whom I happen to be one; he should be a little more temperate and not say that because any of my constituents put up a little meat in a cold storage box, especially when they produce the meat on their own farm, that they are not patriotic.

I do not believe the gentleman from New York knows any more about patriotism than he knows about the beef cattle industry as such if his statement is indicative of his knowledge. I suggest that for a moment he consider his representative functions and duties in a little more detail. A great struggle is going on in this land of ours between people of this country through their representatives in an effort to maintain the sovereignty of the people under a form of government which has been referred to many times as a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. The gentleman is a lawyer. I wish the gentleman would point out where in the "law of the land" as he refers to it, there is succinct, definite authority for many of the regulations which bring about this action on the part of citizens who feel they still have sovereign rights and liberties as citizens of the United States.

I regret very much to feel called upon to speak as I have this afternoon, and I confess that if I had ever been urged to be perfectly free in my utterances and give complete expression to the high distaste, to the sense of outrage engendered by remarks such as the gentleman from New York made concerning patriotic citizens of this country, I would forget my self-restraint to the point of being intemperate in what I might say. These are days—and the gentleman should know it—when public confidence is possibly the greatest motivating influence back of whatever successful war effort this Nation may put forth. Things which harass the people, things which confuse, things which cannot be placed in proper juxtaposition with reason and our form of government perfectly naturally make for confusion and for a certain amount of disrespect not for the law of the land, Mr. Speaker, but for the regulations under which the law is sought to be enforced. A little more confidence in the people of this country by the Government would be the recommendation I would make, and greater confidence in the Government would be the response from the people.

We are confronted with a desperate situation. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle in my earnest opinion who are both thoughtfully and patriotically inclined should give serious thought to bringing the people and their Government into closer cooperation looking toward the end of this war rather than making wild, absurd statements such as charging patriotic citizens with a lack of patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN RECORDS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2943) for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman take this up with the minority members of the committee?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Did they concur in this?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They concurred in it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act, the word "records" includes all books, papers, maps, photographs, or other documentary materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, made or received by any agency of the United States Government in pursuance of Federal law or in connection with the transaction of public business and preserved or appropriate for preservation by that agency or its legitimate successor as evidence of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the Government or because of the informational value of data contained therein. Library and museum material made or acquired and preserved solely for reference or exhibition purposes, extra copies of documents preserved only for convenience of reference, and stocks of publications and of processed documents are not included within the definition of the word "records" as used in this act.

SEC. 2. The National Archives Council shall promulgate regulations, not inconsistent with this act, establishing (1) procedures for the compiling and submitting to the Archivist of the United States of lists and schedules of records proposed for disposal, (2) procedures for the disposal of records authorized for disposal, and (3) standards for the reproduction of records by photographic or microphotographic processes with a view to the disposal of the original records. Such regulations, when approved by the President, shall be binding on all agencies of the United States Government.

SEC. 3. The head of each agency of the United States Government shall submit to the Archivist of the United States, in accordance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act (1) lists of any records in the custody of the agency that have been photographed or microphotographed in accordance with the said regulations and that, as a consequence thereof, do not appear to have sufficient value to warrant their further preservation by the Government; (2) lists of any other records in the custody of the agency that are not needed by it in the transaction of its cur-

rent business and that do not appear to have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their further preservation by the Government; and (3) schedules proposing the disposal after the lapse of specified periods of time of records of a specified form or character that either have accumulated in the custody of the agency or that may accumulate therein at any time after the submission of such schedules and that apparently will not after the lapse of the period specified have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their further preservation by the Government.

SEC. 4. The Archivist shall submit to Congress, at such times as he shall deem expedient, the lists or schedules submitted to him in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of this act, or parts of such lists or schedules, and lists or schedules of any records in his legal custody, insofar as it shall appear to him that the records listed in such lists or schedules do not, or will not after the lapse of the period specified, have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government: *Provided*, That the Archivist shall not submit to Congress lists or schedules of records of any existing agency of the Government in his legal custody without first having obtained the written consent of the head of such agency.

SEC. 5. Whenever the Archivist shall submit lists or schedules to Congress, it shall be the duty of the presiding officer of the Senate to appoint two Senators who, with the members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers of the House of Representatives, shall constitute a joint committee to which all such lists or schedules shall be referred, and the joint committee shall examine such lists or schedules and submit to the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, a report of such examination and its recommendations.

SEC. 6. If the joint committee reports that any of the records listed in a list or schedule referred to it do not, or will not after the lapse of the period specified, have sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the Government, the Archivist shall notify the head of the agency by which the list or schedule was submitted of the action of the joint committee and the head of such agency shall cause such records to be disposed of in accordance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act.

SEC. 7. If the joint committee fails to make a report during any regular or special session of Congress on any list or schedule submitted to Congress by the Archivist not less than 10 days prior to the adjournment of such session, the Archivist may empower the head of the agency who submitted the list or schedule to cause the records listed therein to be disposed of in accordance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act.

SEC. 8. Whenever it shall appear to the Archivist that any agency has in its custody, or is accumulating, records of the same form or character as any records of the same agency previously authorized by Congress to be disposed of, he may empower the head of such agency to dispose of such records, after they have been in existence a specified period of time, in accordance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act and without listing or scheduling them.

SEC. 9. Whenever the Archivist and the head of the agency that has custody of them shall jointly determine that any records in the custody of any agency of the United States Government are a continuing menace to human health or life or to property, the Archivist shall cause such menace to be elim-

inated immediately by whatever method he may deem necessary. If any records in the custody of the Archivist are disposed of under this section, the Archivist shall report the disposal thereof to the agency from which they were transferred.

SEC. 10. At any time during the existence of a state of war between the United States and any other nation or when hostile action by a foreign power appears imminent, the head of any agency of the United States Government may authorize the destruction of any records in his legal custody situated in any military or naval establishment, ship, or other depository outside the territorial limits of continental United States (1) the retention of which would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States or (2) which occupy space urgently needed for military purposes and are, in his opinion, without sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their continued preservation: *Provided*, That within 6 months after the disposal of any such records, the official who directed the disposal thereof shall submit a written report thereon to the Archivist in which he shall describe the character of such records and state when and where the disposal thereof was accomplished.

SEC. 11. The Archivist shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session reports as to the records authorized for disposal under the provisions of section 7 of this act and as to the records disposed of under the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of this act.

SEC. 12. Photographs or microphotographs of any records made in compliance with regulations promulgated as provided in section 2 of this act shall have the same force and effect as the originals thereof would have and shall be treated as originals for the purpose of their admissibility in evidence. Duly certified or authenticated reproductions of such photographs or microphotographs shall be admitted in evidence equally with the original photographs or microphotographs.

SEC. 13. All moneys derived by agencies of the Government from the sale of records authorized for disposal under the provisions of this act shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States unless otherwise required by existing law applicable to the agency.

SEC. 14. The procedures herein described are exclusive and no records of the United States Government shall be alienated or destroyed except in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 15. The act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government", approved August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1219), the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain photographed records of the United States Government, and for other purposes", approved September 24, 1940 (54 Stat. 958), and all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT moves to amend the bill by redesignating sections 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 as sections 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, respectively, and inserting a new section to be numbered 9 and to read as follows:

"Sec. 9. Records pertaining to claims and demands by the Government of the United States or against it, or to any accounts in which the Government of the United States is concerned, either as debtor or creditor, shall not be disposed of by the head of any agency under any authorizations granted pursuant to the provisions of sections 6, 7, and 8 of this act until such claims, demands, and accounts have been settled and adjusted

in the General Accounting Office except upon written approval of the Comptroller General of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made at American University on the Korean Cherry Trees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of June 22.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FOOD FOR OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the noble and generous heart of America is appalled at the reports of health conditions existing in the Nazi-occupied countries in Europe. Not alone is there actual hunger, but also much disease that is carrying off women and children at an alarming rate, while the threat to the future health of these people is terrifying.

To those who would shush-shush us into saying nothing, to those who contend that anything is fair in war, to those who cold-bloodedly tell us that human beings are replaceable, let me say without rancor or bias that the time has come to so modify the United Nations' blockade as to permit the passage of the foods so desperately needed by the starving millions of occupied Europe.

To those who would have us believe that it is necessary to starve women and children in order to win the war, let me say that the records of World Wars No. 1 and No. 2 utterly disprove that contention. The glorious and immortal record of relief performed by Herbert Hoover and his aides back in 1918-19 proves that the lives and health of the millions of women and kiddies in the occupied democracies of Europe can yet be saved without endangering the success of our military plans. So does the present relief work in Greece, initiated by Turkey, and now being carried on by the Swedish and Swiss Red Cross, prove that relief work can be extended to Poland, Norway, Denmark, and the Low Countries, where pestilence, famine, and death walk hand in hand. Let me read to you from State Department Press Release No. 147, dated April 19, of this year, in confirmation of what I say. It reads in part as follows:

This Government and the British Government have received regular reports through the Swedish Government, which has generously assumed responsibility for this scheme, under the general auspices of the International Red Cross Committee, confirming that the foodstuffs sent into Greece are being distributed to the Greek population without interference by the occupation authorities and that there has been no diversion of these supplies to the enemy. Furthermore, these reports indicate that the Axis authorities have entered into agreement with the Swedish-Swiss Relief Commission for the implementation of their pledge, given to the Swedish Government in connection with the negotiations preceding the initiation of the scheme, that Greek native produce would be reserved solely for normal peacetime residents of Greece except insofar as local foodstuffs consumed by the armed forces or officials of the occupying powers are replaced by equivalent foodstuffs imported from Axis sources for the Greek population.

This Government's approval of the Greek relief scheme was announced to the press by this Department on August 7, 1942, on which date the first of the 8 Swedish vessels engaged for the purpose departed from Montreal for Piraeus. These vessels, charter-hire on which is now being met principally by this Government, are carrying monthly quantities of 15,000 tons of wheat donated by the Canadian Government; 3,000 tons of dried vegetables and 300 tons of evaporated milk supplied by this Government; medical supplies furnished principally by the American Red Cross; and miscellaneous supplies and equipment donated by the Greek War Relief Association.

These relief supplies are distributed to the Greek people by a neutral relief commission of 30 Swedish and Swiss nationals under the chairmanship of the distinguished Swedish jurist, Emil Sandstrom. The commission is aided in its task by some 800 carefully selected Greek employees.

To insure its independent mobility, the commission has been supplied with its own motor vehicles. It is in a position to insure close surveillance and control over the distribution of all relief supplies received and to report fully thereon to this Government and the British Government, which will of course agree to the continuance of the scheme only so long as they are satisfied that it is not in fact benefiting the enemy.

Greece is 100-percent occupied by the Axis Powers. If food can be shipped into starving Greece without in any way helping the Axis, why cannot food be shipped to Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and the Low Countries? That is something that those responsible for the "blockade of starvation" will find it difficult to explain. They simply cannot explain. In talking with Prime Minister Churchill about it, a few days before his departure from Washington, he said that for every ton of relief food shipped into the occupied countries, Germany would cut down their allowance by just that much. When I related this to Herbert Hoover a week later, Mr. Hoover explained that the food being sent into occupied areas, by the Germans, lacks vitamins, proteins, and fats—food elements that children must have if they are to grow into healthy adulthood. Germany can only spare grains and potatoes and these are not suitable foods for growing children. Then, too, the Nazis have promised to not cut down on their shipments of food into occupied countries to offset foods shipped in from other countries.

The able and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] is an outstanding authority on distribution of relief, having been one of Mr. Hoover's trusted assistants in carrying out Belgian relief back in 1918. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] says:

I had ample opportunity to observe the controls of foodstuffs in occupied Belgium and northern France during the last war, as well as in Russia in 1922. During the time that I was in Belgium, the supervision for the importation and the distribution of all foodstuffs was in the hands of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, an organization supervised by representatives of the Spanish, Dutch, and American Governments, and manned almost exclusively by Americans with the aid of a few Dutch. In addition, a great many Belgians were employed within the country. Most of the food came into Belgium and northern France by barge through Rotterdam and Amsterdam. All shipments were checked at every stage in their progress so as to avoid any thefts. Distributions from warehouses to local committees set up by the burgomasters in various towns and cities were again checked and constant inspection was made with respect to the actual allocation of every item of food. Through this method of supervision, it was impossible for the occupying authorities—that is, the Germans—to steal any of the food without immediate reports thereof going to headquarters. Under an agreement with the German authorities, no indigenous foodstuffs could be exported from Belgium. Whenever the movement of even a cartload of vegetables or cereals across the border was reported, replacement of the same was immediately demanded and restitution was made.

It is my understanding that the suggestions which have been repeatedly made for feeding the children in occupied areas would follow the same controls as those exercised during the last war. However, there is one added safeguard. The feeding is confined to the women and children. It can be done through soup kitchens to which the children go for the food. The inspection would be simplified, and complete assurance that none was reaching the occupying authorities could be guaranteed. Insofar as the removal of indigenous foodstuffs is concerned, as well as requiring the occupying authorities to furnish the same proportions of food that they previously supplied, this can very readily be done by those who have had any experience with the shipment and warehousing of foodstuffs. To the lay mind, it all seems very difficult, but to those who have seen it in actual operation it is not a complicated process.

Some of the occupied countries have sufficient credits abroad for taking care of their own nationals providing the United Nations will but give them permission to pass relief food through the blockade. As I recall, all of them have the necessary credits. Take the case of Norway, whose unhappy situation I am somewhat familiar with: There is now due Norwegian shipowners large sums of money by the United Nations, for the use of Norwegian ships. This money has been requisitioned by the Norwegian Government in exile and is available for the purchase of the grains, dairy products, fats, and clothing so desperately needed for their women and little ones. These foods can be purchased in Argentina, and Swedish ships are available for transportation. The record shows that

the Axis are agreeable to this being done, but not so Uncle Sam and John Bull.

There are only two individuals in all the world who can give the word that will permit relief food and clothing to be sent into the occupied countries to save the lives of millions of women and kiddies. They are Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the able gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it be possible under a plan of this kind to try it out with a few shipments of food and ascertain whether or not it is helping these people, and, if so, continue with it? In other words, is there any argument against a trial on the part of the heads of either the British Government or the American Government?

Mr. KNUTSON. No good and valid reason has been given why it should not be tried out, but I would like to call on the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] to answer that question in detail, as he can speak from experience.

Mr. HERTER. I think there is no valid reason whatsoever once it is begun. If you find that the enemy is making use of the foodstuffs that you have imported or is drawing out of the country some of its own foodstuffs to make up for what is sent in for relief purposes, the entire operation can be stopped immediately. In fact, the operation can begin with that understanding; and if that is done, it immediately puts the full blame for the starving and the miserable health of these people on the occupying authorities.

Mr. CURTIS. Can you ascertain the truth of the situation after the food is sent in there?

Mr. HERTER. There is no difficulty whatever in ascertaining the truth. Large quantities of foodstuffs cannot be moved from place to place without the population knowing that it is being moved. In the entire Belgium and northern France operation, where 10,000,000 people were being fed, there were, roughly, 200 Americans, and they knew exactly where every bit of food was during its entire progress up to the time of consumption in that area.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Massachusetts is probably as competent an authority on the question of relief as any man in Washington or outside of Washington.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the able gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman know what reasons are given by the powers that be whom the gentleman mentioned for not permitting this food to go in? There must be some reason. What is the excuse that is given?

Mr. KNUTSON. The excuse that Mr. Churchill gave me was that for every ton of food that we would ship in the Germans would reduce their shipments into the country by that much, but that is not a valid reason because the foods that are being shipped in by the German

Government consist of grains, cereals, and potatoes. The gentleman, being a medical authority, knows that is not proper food for growing children.

Mr. JUDD. That is correct. Has there been evidence in Greece, where this has been very carefully supervised by neutral powers, that the Germans were ever sending food into Greece and now are sending in less than they were before?

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me again quote from the State Department Release No. 147, dated April 19:

This Government and the British Government have received regular reports through the Swedish Government, which has generously assumed responsibility for this scheme, under the general auspices of the International Red Cross Committee, confirming that the foodstuffs sent into Greece are being distributed to the Greek population without interference by the occupation authorities, and there has been no diversion of these supplies to the enemy.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that a good many Americans who vigorously opposed this relief plan at the beginning, feeling it would reduce the general effectiveness and that the kindest thing that could be done to these people was to get the war over as soon as possible, have now reversed themselves and have repeatedly said, publicly and privately, that they were wrong and they now strongly urge that measures be taken to allow food for women and children to run the blockade?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true. I have a list of names in my office of a very large number of persons who 18 months ago vigorously opposed sending food to the occupied countries, but now are just as vigorous in demanding that food be sent there.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. In line with what the gentleman from Minnesota has said, as a matter of record the Society of Friends, the Quakers, are feeding 20,000 people in occupied France now.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; so I understand.

Mr. HORAN. This should form a pattern that a larger operation could follow.

Mr. KNUTSON. What the Society of Friends is doing in northern France, and what the Swedes and Swiss are doing in Greece can be done in Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and the Low Countries, as well as in the balance of occupied France.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that the reason for the change in the position of these individuals the gentleman has mentioned is not a matter of humanitarianism or sentimentality, it is a matter of observation of an actual experiment that has been carried on these long months? It is not a matter of theory, it is a demonstrated fact that this can be done. After all, what are we fighting the war for if it is to save freedom for corpses?

Mr. KNUTSON. Exactly. How much more helpful would it be to the cause of the United Nations if they were greeted by virile and vigorous people once they get ready to invade these countries, rather than by a people who have lost hope and are disease-stricken, who are absolutely helpless as far as giving aid to the invaders is concerned?

Must we continue to let the German propaganda machine say to the occupied allies that they are being starved by England and the United States?

Must the governments in exile, when they return home, be met by a debilitated, starved, and sickly population and also by crosses row on row that mark the places where sleep thousands who needlessly died from starvation and pestilence?

And when the invasions come, as they must, shall our military leaders be met by a strong and healthy population, vigorous and able to carry on the fight for freedom, or must their main work be fighting pestilence?

Who can supply the food and medical supplies so badly needed? I believe America can, in spite of the so-called food shortage; but if we cannot, then Canada and Argentina can, if they are permitted to send the supplies through the United Nations' blockade. Germany has agreed to permit the supplies to be distributed under the supervision of the International Red Cross or similar organizations, as is now being done in Greece.

Norway could supply her own tonnage, but it would be better and safer to use ships of neutral registry—perhaps by trading ships for the purpose, temporarily.

The technical problems are very simple and can easily be handled if England and the United States will agree to the principle.

On Tuesday last the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] and I had a conference with Herbert H. Lehman, Director of the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations, regarding the situation in occupied Europe. We found Governor Lehman sympathetic and willing to do all in his power to give aid. His was an excellent choice for that important position. Unfortunately for the sufferers in other lands, Governor Lehman is almost helpless in this crisis, as he has no voice in policymaking. That rests with Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill alone. One word from either of them would banish all the horrors of famine and pestilence from Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and the Low Countries. Will they arise to the occasion? The future of white civilization in Europe rests in their hands.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from today's Washington News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from California, where hearings were held for 2 weeks regarding the War Relocation Authority centers located in the West, I feel that I should make a report to the House regarding the evidence presented at those hearings.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] served with me as a special subcommittee of the Dies committee to investigate un-American activities. It was our purpose to determine to what extent the Japanese Government or Japanese agents might be continuing to exercise subversive influence upon the people of Japanese ancestry who are concentrated in the relocation centers. The committee investigators made a 5,000-mile trip looking into conditions at each of the centers with the exception of Tule Lake. Upon completion of their investigation, the hearings were opened in Los Angeles and numerous witnesses appeared at that time. In order to obtain a very clear picture of conditions in the centers, our hearings were very largely confined to the relocation center at Poston, Ariz. The conditions uncovered at that center are illustrative of the conditions existing at each of the other centers as evidenced by the work of the committee investigators.

It is quite evident from our investigation that the operation of these centers has not been entirely satisfactory. While the living conditions are not too good, and the living quarters are overcrowded without exception, nevertheless better results could have been obtained under different handling. No effort seems to have been made to promote a program of Americanism amongst these Japanese people. On the contrary, it is quite apparent that the disloyal Japanese have assumed the ascendancy and have dominated the operation and control of the centers. They have endeavored to influence the thinking of all the Japanese and to force a sentiment favorable to Japan to be expressed by all the evacuees. Instances in which Japanese evacuees have shown a pro-American attitude have resulted in their being assaulted and beaten by the disloyal. At Manzanar, particularly, some 30 loyal Japanese were removed from the center and placed in an abandoned C. C. C. camp in an isolated area of Death Valley. Instead of penalizing the miscreants, the loyal Japanese were sent into isolated confinement, presumably for their protection. Not only has there been no effort to segregate the disloyal and un-American Japanese from those who desire to remain loyal but on the contrary the disloyal have been given positions of prominence and power in each of the centers.

Each center is divided into various blocks and in each block there are 14

barracks, each of these being divided into 4 large rooms. A family resides in one of these rooms. In addition to the barracks, there is a large recreation hall, a laundry, community lavatories, and the community mess hall. No individual facilities are provided in any of the barracks. The entire living is on a community basis. In the organization of the centers, block leaders are elected by the Japanese and these leaders may be foreign-born or American-born. For the information of the Members, I might explain that the foreign-born Japanese are known as Issei, while those Japanese who are native to this country are known as Nisei. However, the Nisei group have a subdivision known as Kibei. These are the Japanese who have been born in this country, have been educated in Japan, and then have come back here to live. The older Japanese, while they adhere to Japanese customs and ways of life and exert some influence upon the younger Japanese, are not a serious menace. So likewise the Japanese women, enjoying as they do in this country a status of equality with the men, are not inclined to be favorable to Japan where they occupy a very inferior position and are considered as chattels. The majority of Nisei, if removed from a pro-Japan influence, would develop into patriotic and loyal citizens in the main. They readily adopt American customs, American sports, and an American way of life. However, those natives who have been educated in Japan have become the most sinister influence among the Japanese peoples.

These Kibei have received in Japan a thorough indoctrination in Japanese history, culture, and customs. Their education has been almost exclusively devoted to military training. They have been indoctrinated in the art of espionage, military tactics, and Japanese propaganda. Upon their return to the Pacific coast they have established clubs and organizations through which they have endeavored to indoctrinate those Nisei who otherwise would not have come in contact with un-American sentiments. Over 40 clubs of the Butoku-Kai were established on the Pacific coast. Approximately 10,000 Nisei were members. The Butoku-Kai has been in effect a junior branch of the Black Dragon Society of Japan. One of the main cloaks behind which militarism is taught these Japanese is the sport of judo, which resembles the American sport of wrestling, but, on the contrary, is definitely interwoven with Japanese ceremonials and is an important part of the training of every Japanese soldier.

At the relocation centers, instructors in judo have been hired to teach the Japanese this military sport. In addition, speakers have been allowed to visit the various centers and address the evacuees in Japanese. The papers published at each of the centers are largely written in Japanese. In spite of all this, there is practically no one connected with the War Relocation Authority who understands or speaks Japanese, much less reads Japanese.

Invariably each disturbance that has occurred at the centers has brought about an increased control of the operation of the centers by the Japanese themselves. Invariably the W. R. A. administrators have acceded to the demands of the Japanese. Invariably the Kibei group, along with some Issei, have obtained more and more control of the centers. It is unfortunate that the personnel directing these centers almost without exception lack any prior experience with Japanese people or Japanese customs. At Poston, the Administration is in charge of persons loaned by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As a consequence, the administration of the center has been patterned after the administration of Indian reservations generally. The perpetuation of Japanese customs, games, and sports has been encouraged rather than discouraged, all of which make it possible to stir up pro-Japanese sentiment within the center to the detriment of those who would oppose such a program and who desire to maintain their loyalty to the United States. Finally, a new program of cooperatives is being inaugurated by the W. R. A. at the Rivers Relocation Center. A system of cooperatives has been inaugurated with each Japanese in the center being entitled to own a certificate of membership in the cooperative. The persons in control of this cooperative are definitely disloyal Japanese who are utilizing the cooperative as a means of dominating their fellow evacuees. With every Japanese a member of the cooperative, each evacuee comes, therefore, directly under the domination of those controlling the cooperative. In this instance, as in others, the disloyal Japanese have seized upon the opportunity to gain greater control and to enforce greater loyalty to Japan.

The release of the Japanese evacuees should be stopped at once, as there has been absolutely no genuine effort to determine the fitness of the Japanese being released. Even those Japanese who originally had been interned by the F. B. I. at the outbreak of war and who have been released to the relocation centers are today eligible to be released anywhere in the United States except the restricted area of the Pacific coast. I need not state that the sentiment of the people of the Pacific coast, as well as Arizona, is vigorously opposed to the return of Japanese evacuees to those areas at any time during the present war, and it is well to add that the United States is at war with Japan, which apparently the administrators of the W. R. A. seem to have either ignored or forgotten.

As a result of the hearings on the Pacific coast, the committee released the following statement:

First. Project personnel lacks previous experience in dealing with Japanese people prior to their present assignments.

Second. There has been no adequate segregation made of loyal and disloyal Japanese.

Third. Government funds have been expended unwisely for such things as teaching the Japanese judo, a form of

Japanese military training; teaching the Japanese to play goh, a form of Japanese checkers; paying salaries to lecturers who visited the centers in an effort to install cooperatives in the centers.

Fourth. Outbreaks of violence, including riots and strikes, induced by the Kibel group, have occurred, yet the instigators have gone unpunished.

Fifth. Loyal Japanese-Americans have suffered beatings at the hands of pro-Japanese in the centers yet the miscreants have gone unpunished. The loyal Japanese have not been afforded the protection to which they are entitled.

Sixth. There are indications that confusion exists as to the responsibility for investigating the personal history and background of the Japanese who are being released at this time from the centers.

Seventh. There is evidence in the hearings that there is lack of planning by the procurement officers of the projects, particularly in regard to food purchases.

Eighth. Sufficient work opportunities for the Japanese have not been provided in the various centers so as to utilize properly the available manpower in a constructive manner.

Ninth. More adequate protection should be given to public utilities, dams, reservoirs and other strategic installations in the vicinity of the relocation centers. The committee is specifically notifying the Governors of California and Arizona regarding this situation in their States.

Tenth. While housing has been provided for all Japanese evacuees, overcrowding is apparent. The lack of privacy and the existence of cramped quarters create a condition that should be remedied immediately.

These conditions not only need immediate remedial treatment but they never would have occurred had a more definite policy and a more vigorous direction emanated from Washington. Generally, the local administrators of the centers are capable individuals but they have not had adequate direction and supervision from Washington. Unless there is an immediate change of program in these centers the net result will be that practically the entire group of people of Japanese ancestry will be so thoroughly indoctrinated with anti-American principles as to make an undesirable element in our population, this in spite of the fact that no finer opportunity for Americanization has ever been granted any Government agency.

A new policy regarding the management and operation of the centers should be inaugurated without delay.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. When Mr. Dillon S. Myer, the Administrator of the War Relocation Authority, was before the California delegation some weeks ago, he mentioned the fact that the W. R. A. had originally been authorized to construct 12 camps but that they had constructed only 10 of them. He then made the complaint that the reason they were unable to accomplish this segregation the

gentleman speaks of was that they did not have enough camps. Does the gentleman know the reason why the additional 2 camps were not constructed, which would have at least permitted the segregation?

Mr. COSTELLO. I may say to the gentleman that ample funds have been provided to the War Relocation Authority to allow them to build the number of camps they might desire. Why they have not built the others I do not know. But if they had really desired to install a program of segregation they could have gradually worked out a program of moving the disloyal Japanese into one camp and taking the loyal Japanese out of that camp, and gradually made one camp a center for disloyal Japanese. Absolutely no effort was made in that regard.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I wonder if the gentleman has heard those who have charge of the War Relocation Authority. Who has charge of it?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Dillon S. Myer is the Director of it.

Mr. PATMAN. Did you interrogate him?

Mr. COSTELLO. The committee is going to have hearings starting on Wednesday here in Washington, at which time undoubtedly Mr. Myer will be called as a witness.

Mr. PATMAN. It just occurred to me that the statements the gentleman made were rather unusual, that anyone would permit things like that to go on. I was just wondering why the gentleman did not hear those who are in charge of the War Relocation Authority.

Mr. COSTELLO. The investigation on the Pacific coast was confined to witnesses who are located out in that area.

Mr. PATMAN. But you will give the people in charge a chance to explain?

Mr. COSTELLO. On Wednesday hearings will start here in Washington, and Mr. Myer will be called as a witness during the course of the hearings here in Washington.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from California, as I have said before, that I am in favor of shipping them back to Japan when this war is over. The way to tell which ones ought to be shipped back to Japan is, I would just take a blood test.

Mr. HINSHAW. In pursuance of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, if the gentleman will yield, while it was not an official occasion, not one where the testimony was given under oath, Mr. Dillon S. Myer spent several hours with the California delegation on this very question not long ago.

Mr. COSTELLO. I thank the gentleman. I assure him it is the intention of our committee to hear Mr. Myer during the course of the coming week. I may also suggest that the hearings which were held in California were open, and representatives of the press were free to at-

tend and to take what notes they wished to make.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wish to compliment the gentleman and his committee on doing a splendid job in their investigation of this highly complex and important subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I presume it is the intention of the subcommittee, of which the gentleman is chairman, after completing the hearings, to report to the House and make the necessary recommendations in connection with an attempt to solve this problem.

Mr. COSTELLO. Undoubtedly, as soon as the hearings have been completed here in Washington, a report will be made by the Dies committee to the House regarding the entire matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Did the gentleman's committee have an opportunity to ascertain whether or not the Japanese who are now wearing the United States Army uniform are coming back into California in any numbers?

Mr. COSTELLO. General DeWitt issued an order on April 18 allowing persons of Japanese ancestry who are members of the United States armed forces to return to restricted areas. So far that is the only lifting of the restriction on persons of Japanese ancestry entering the restricted areas.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Are they coming back to California in any large numbers?

Mr. COSTELLO. It has not been definitely indicated to us whether any soldiers of Japanese ancestry have gone out there or not. Rumors came to us from time to time that some had been seen in southern California or at different cities around that area.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. But you were unable to check up?

Mr. COSTELLO. We were unable to check up and verify those rumors as to whether they were or were not. Actually there is no purpose in their returning to the Pacific coast in view of the fact that their relatives are not residing in the restricted area. Unless it would be to visit someone who is located in a hospital there who has not been evacuated, there would be no purpose in an American soldier of Japanese ancestry going into that area.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman will recall that a couple of months ago we had a discussion on this same subject right here on the floor of the House, at which time questions were raised as to the possibility of distinguishing loyal from disloyal Japanese. Does the gentleman think the War Relocation Authority or the F. B. I., or anyone else,

has yet devised a proper method for distinguishing loyal from disloyal Japanese?

Mr. COSTELLO. Frankly, I do not believe they have. As a matter of fact, it is very apparent that none of the administrators of these centers has ever had any experience with Japanese people prior to their coming into control of the centers. I admit it is a tough job to direct a camp of 17,000 people—men, women, and children—directing their entire lives; but they knew nothing of their customs, nothing of their experience, nothing of their habits, yet they were assigned the task of directing their entire mode of living. It is a difficult thing to do. I think they should have obtained some men who had a little prior experience with the Japanese people before doing so.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of California. The gentleman spoke of 10 recommendations. Will the gentleman place those in the Record?

Mr. COSTELLO. They are incorporated as a part of my remarks. I did not repeat them in view of the fact that they have already been published.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Would the gentleman say that the prime difficulty was in the original statement of the Japanese, that they were treated so as to make it a race question, instead of as against a pro-America and an anti-America?

Mr. COSTELLO. Just what does the gentleman mean?

Mr. ROGERS of California. In that they were all treated alike as Japanese, when they should have been treated separately, as those Japanese that were pro-American and those that were pro-Japanese.

Mr. COSTELLO. My thought was that once they had been removed from the evacuation centers to the relocation camps, an effort should have been made to distinguish between the good and the bad; at least on those occasions when disloyal Japanese seized upon and beat up pro-American Japanese, then those troublemakers should have been punished. Instead, that was not done, no effort was made to do that, and in any number of instances as a result of this, disloyal Japanese got bolder, and assumed more and more power, and they definitely showed that they are for the Japanese, and that nothing was happening to them, that Americans were too soft, that they did not know how to run a camp, so how could they win a war. That was a perfect medium for them to spread propaganda to the effect that Japan was going to win the war, and these others were told that they had better be loyal, or when the Japs won the war and when they took over America after the war was over it would be a sorry day for them.

Mr. ROGERS of California. I agree entirely with the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Did the gentleman discover whether there was much resentment on the part of the Japanese at

their original removal from the Pacific-coast area?

Mr. COSTELLO. Generally, I think there was no resentment on their part on being evacuated. They thought that was in the interest of their safety as well as for the general protection of the country. In the centers, the pro-Japanese groups, uncontrolled, have stirred up dissatisfaction.

Mr. JUDD. So that the resentment among those who were originally loyal is the result of what has occurred since that time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes, I think there was very little resentment in the fact that the Japanese had been evacuated from the Pacific coast.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to know if at the hearing anything was brought out that would throw light on the exchange of prisoners, in the fact that we would like to send disloyal Japanese back, and the Japanese in exchange would send our soldiers who are in the Philippines, or in the islands of Japan. I understand that a policy of that sort has grown up in Japan relative to the return.

Mr. COSTELLO. Not to any extent. There has been an effort on the part of the Japanese Government to repatriate some of their nationals and one case we did run across was where Japan had requested a return to Japan of an American-born Japanese who had been aiding in the work of evacuating the Japanese from the Pacific coast. That individual has been released from the evacuation center into the eastern part of the United States. He never was in a relocation center at all, and yet here is a Japanese who was born in this country that Japan is asking to have repatriated as a national to Japan, indicating definitely, their recognition of dual citizenship.

Mr. HORAN. To reward or to punish him?

Mr. COSTELLO. I think it was a case of having a valuable man returned to Japan, in order to utilize his services still further.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS] spoke about treating this matter as a matter of loyalty or disloyalty, instead of treating it as a race matter, which undoubtedly it is. As a matter of fact, Americans have been living in Japan for many, many years, and they are now being sent to the United States. Also I call attention to the fact that they endeavor to apply that policy that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS] has advo-

cated in the Hawaiian Islands, with the result that those loyal Japanese helped to bring about the Pearl Harbor disaster.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. To what extent are these Japs being used as useful labor on the farms or otherwise, to relieve the labor shortage?

Mr. COSTELLO. Unfortunately, the provision of work at the centers has not developed as rapidly as it should. At one center, near Poston, Ariz., there were available twenty to thirty thousand acres that could be put into cultivation, and only 300 acres have actually been cultivated. It has been claimed that there has been no machinery with which to do the work. At least two or three thousand acres should have been in cultivation at this time, and the Japanese would have found at Poston, Ariz., adequate opportunities to keep them busy and occupied.

I think you would have much less difficulty with them if they were given plenty of work to do.

Mr. HANCOCK. So we feed them and house them in idleness?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct. The pay they receive is limited to from \$16 to \$19 a month. Nothing more than that can be received, regardless of how much work they perform.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Did your committee ascertain whether any of these Japanese were being returned to Oregon, California, and Washington?

Mr. COSTELLO. As far as I know, none of the Japanese has been released to the Pacific coast. Some of them have been released to the State of Arizona, very much against the protest of the people of Arizona. However, on the Wednesday before we visited the center at Poston, I understand an order was issued announcing that no more Japanese would be released to Arizona. I am sure no Japanese will be released to the three Pacific Coast States.

Mr. ANGELL. Are the releases taking place as rapidly as they were 3 weeks ago?

Mr. COSTELLO. I do not know, but I understand they were being released at the rate of 1,000 a week. At least 15,000 or more have been released from the centers and have been able to establish themselves elsewhere in the country without any direct supervision or control.

Mr. ANGELL. I call the gentleman's attention to an extension I placed in the Record today from the Legion post at Portland, Oreg., protesting against the release of these Japanese.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on two subjects

and to include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TAVER] may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, H. R. 2481.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, H. R. 2714.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit all of the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment and omit all of the matter proposed to be inserted in lieu thereof by action of the Senate and House of Representatives; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morris Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 61.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendments numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 5: The original House bill carries provision extending until June 30, 1944, the unexpended balance in the President's emergency fund on June 30, 1943. To this provision the House added a prohibition on the use of the fund for making allocation to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration. The Senate struck out this provision and inserted language of a general character restricting the use of the fund. The House adopted the Senate proposed language modified so as to make exemptions for the Army, Navy, State Department, and Office of Strategic Services but left the Senate language applicable to all other Federal agencies. The Senate accepted the House modification of the Senate language but added a further exception for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The conference agreement omits the original House amendment relating to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration, and also omits all other proposed substitute language of the Senate and House and leaves the continuation of the fund in the form originally reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations. The House provision relating to the Planning Board and Farm Security is covered in other measures. The independent offices appropriation bill, 1944, contains provision prohibiting the funds for that Board in that bill from being supplemented from any other source and similar provision with respect to Farm Security is contemplated in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill, 1944, now pending.

No. 60: The House bill, by section 304, contains a prohibition on the use of any Federal funds, after the date of the enactment of the bill, for continuing in Federal employment Goodwin B. Watson, Wm. E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morris Lovett. The Senate struck out this section. The conference agreement restores the section modified so as to prohibit the use of Federal funds for their employment after November 15, 1943, unless such persons, prior to that date, have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

No. 61: Corrects a section number; the amendment is reported in disagreement. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment correcting the section number and inserting a paragraph to make appropriations in the bill, or portions of appropriations, available for obligation in the fiscal

year 1944, retroactive to July 1 in the event the bill does not become a law by that date.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EATON (at the request of Mr. POWERS), for 5 days, on account of Government business.

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. FAY (at the request of Mr. SLAUGHTER), indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 338. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed \$1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits.

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. R. 2409. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2612. An act to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 29, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect naval

petroleum reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, June 29, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 1767 and H. R. 349.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The special subcommittee on bankruptcy and reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 30, 1943. Business to be considered: To hear Mr. MacLeod, Office of Price Administration.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

519. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on a list of papers reported to him for disposal by the United States Maritime Commission; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

520. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers reported to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

521. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Housing Agency in the amount of \$300,000,000 for war housing (H. Doc. No. 246); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

522. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

523. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of costs, cancellations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects compiled as of June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

524. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the statement that since the act of Congress approved February 19, 1943 (Public Law 1, 78th Cong., ch. 1, 1st sess.), no acquisition of land, by lease or otherwise, has been effected pursuant to its authority; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3055. A bill to repeal Public Law No. 89 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3056. A bill to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3057. A bill to amend the law relative to the collection of seed and feed and other agricultural loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3058. A bill to provide for post-war planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 3059. A bill granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War With Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. Res. 272. Resolution to investigate the relationship of assistance granted by agencies of the United States Government to the Shipshaw project in Canada to the program of the United States for furnishing metals for war purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. Res. 273. Resolution authorizing a study by the Committee on the Public Lands of certain public-land problems; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to afford a reasonable opportunity to every member of the military forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 3060. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Parker and Orion C. Parker, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3061. A bill for the relief of Ina Burke Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of the board of trustees, Summerville Consolidated School District, Chattooga County, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3063. A bill for the relief of James J. Orme; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3064. A bill for the relief of Cleo Pickrell, of Tipton, Okla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 3065. A bill for the relief of H. E. Terrell, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1753. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1754. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition presented by W. L. Williams, of Grayville, Ill., signed by 60 members and friends of the Methodist Church of Grayville, Ill., urging legislation to prevent all kinds of advertisements of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1755. Also, communications from Herbert Austin, of Carmi; Ellis Hall, of Louisville; L. E. Stoutenberg, of Flora; and Adolph I. Desch, of Wendell, Ill., representative citizens of southern Illinois, earnestly opposing the proposed subsidy and roll-back on food prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1756. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Nellie O. Taylor and 27 other citizens of Elma, Wash., and vicinity, requesting the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1757. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of Etta Buckley and 128 other citizens of Clark County, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1758. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by A. Erickson, of Canby, Oreg., and 19 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1759. Also, petition signed by A. H. Smith and 39 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging passage of the Cullin bill (H. R. 1924); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1760. By Mr. LAFOLLETTE: Petition of the Dubois County (Ind.) Farmers Guild denouncing the activities of and demanding the repeal of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the stoppage of all appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1761. By Mr. SHAFER: Resolution adopted by General George A. Custer Post No. 54, the American Legion, Battle Creek, Mich., protesting against the release of Japanese from war relocation centers, requesting return to such centers of persons already released and advocating placing war relocation centers under military authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1762. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of 348 citizens of Lucas County, Ohio, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH P. BRAYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed the production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1763. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Gertrude M. Sowers and 458 other residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1764. Also, petition of Mrs. Flonda K. Dyer and 29 other residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1765. By Mr. WALTER: Petition regarding House bill 1012; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1766. By Mr. WELCH: Tabulated record of sentiments of representative group of citizens of Salinas, Calif., regarding the Japanese situation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1767. Also, petition of the County Supervisors Association of California, adopted June 18, 1943, regarding the Japanese situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1768. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of the Reciprocity Club, affiliate of Cincinnati Club, Cincinnati, Ohio, signed by 39 residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1769. Also, petition of Herbert Hoffheimer and signed by 19 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1770. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council, adopted June 19, 1943, supporting the action taken by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors requesting that priorities be granted for the construction of 5,000 moderately priced family dwellings for war workers within the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1771. Also, resolution of the San Francisco building and construction trades council, relative to increasing dependency allotments to aged mothers and fathers of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1772. Also, resolution of the Berkeley Lodge, No. 1002, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, commending Gen. John L. DeWitt for the efficient manner in which he conducted the registration and removal of persons of Japanese descent to relocation centers and the courageous stand he has taken in all matters connected therewith, and opposing any action toward the release of native-born Japanese from the relocation centers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1773. Also, resolution of the County Supervisors Association of California, Sacramento, Calif., expressing appreciation of the services of Gen. John L. DeWitt and their confidence in his leadership, and urging those in authority to approve the acts and orders of General DeWitt, particularly in reference to the evacuation of the Japanese people, and to continue General DeWitt in charge of the Western Defense area; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1774. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Atlantic States Shippers Advisory Board, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to additional governmental agencies for the purposes of regulating, controlling, or developing transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

mend its flaws and make it the fit instrument of Thy will in these troubled days. Forgive us that so often drunk with sight of power we have loosed wild tongues that have not Thee in awe.

History's tragic pages remind us that Thy providence knows no favorites, that naught can bend Thy justice and none can break Thy laws that shall not themselves be broken. Facing duties and decisions that outweigh our own strength and our own wisdom, we ask for courage to do the right as Thou dost give us to see the right. More potent than the raucous voices without may there come the whisper of a still voice within, heard only by obedient hearts:

"Men may misjudge thy aim,
Think they have cause for blame,
Say thou art wrong.
Hold on thy quiet way;
God is the judge—not they.
Fear not, be strong."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 28, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hatch	Pepper
Andrews	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Evercomb
Barkley	Holman	Reynolds
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bone	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scruggs
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdoch	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gurney	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr.

CLARK] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF ARMOND W. SCOTT TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of July 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Armond W. Scott, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF THOMAS D. QUINN TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of July 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

COSTS, CANCELLATIONS, AND MISCELLANEOUS DATA OF INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of costs, cancellations, and miscellaneous irrigation data of Indian irrigation projects for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LAND ACQUISITIONS BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who countest the nations as the dust of the balance, who puttest down the mighty from their seat and exalteth the humble and the meek, have mercy upon our Nation as we strive to